



# WHITHER HYDERABAD?

**(A brief study of some of the outstanding  
problems of the Premier Indian State).**

*By*

SYED ABID HASAN

**Price : Rupee One.**



To Honour  
The Memory of  
The Late Lamented  
NAWAB MIR TURAB ALI KHAN,  
SHUJAUDOWLAH, MUKHTARUL MULK  
SIR SALAR JUNG G.C.S.I., D.C.L.  
who undertook great risks  
and long journeys to secure  
for Hyderabad her cherished  
rights and, having failed,  
died broken hearted.

“Of all forms of tyranny, the worst is that of a nation  
over a nation; heaviest of all yokes, is the yoke of the  
stranger”.

LORD MACAULAY.



## DEDICATION.

I dedicate this humble effort of mine

TO

INDIAN WOMANHOOD

because an Indian woman is strictly Loyal to her husband' even though the latter may be the worst tyrant on God's earth. I have done so, because I see a striking parallel between Indian wives and subjects of Indian States. Just as Indian wives will never and should never betray their husbands in any circumstances, so do I expect subjects of Indian States never to betray their rulers in any circumstances and never to flirt with foreigners, howsoever pleasing and profitable the venture might seem.

S. A. H.

"The essential in any settlement of the Hyderabad problem is to remember that the Resident cannot be trusted to advise for good".

—MR. BLUNT

IN

"INDIA UNDER RIPON".



## PREFACE.

To an outsider, unacquainted with Hyderabad affairs, our State might outwardly present a picture of peace and contentment. But if you scratch the surface, you will begin to see the sore of discontent that is robbing every Hyderabadi of his happiness. The Mulki Movement is born of this wide-spread discontent in the State, and the movement will live, in some shape or form, as long as that discontent remains.

Students of philosophy might argue that human contentment can never be totally achieved and that discontent is a healthy sign and leads to progress. That is perfectly true. But, in Hyderabad, the kind of discontent that prevails does not stimulate people to action but demoralises and devitalises them. Ours is a discontent that is breeding an inferiority complex and robbing us of all sense of decency and self-respect. It is this feeling that has first got to be fought and overcome.

When the tentative creed of our proposed All-Hyderabad Nationalist Organisation was first issued, several friends suggested to me that every clause of our creed could be developed and expanded into pages: so comprehensive and exhaustive was the draft.

Amidst distractions of all kinds I have attempted, though in a cursory manner, to explain the creed, as I have understood it. The views expressed herein are my own and need not necessarily be shared by the other signatories to the draft creed.

The following is my brief analysis of the creed:—

1. The creed is thoroughly nationalistic and free from all traces of communalism. This is the first guarantee of its success, provided it is faithfully and sincerely worked.

2. The creed does not ignore the hard realities of the present day situation both in this country and abroad. It has taken note of all the forces that are at work in the world today and has chalked out a course for itself that is best suited to the genius, the traditions and the sentiments of the people of Hyderabad.

3. The creed makes an honest and situated attempt to assign to every factor, in the political

life of Hyderabad, its proper place by setting up limits within which that particular factor ought to function. It has assigned to the Ruler "The King can do no wrong" position. It has defined paramountcy, and it has also prescribed the boundaries which popular enthusiasm should not overstep.

4. Although a purely Mulki programme, designed only to benefit the people of Hyderabad, it does not go counter to the Indian renaissance movement. On the other hand, the Mulki Movement of Hyderabad, if properly understood and worked, will prove of real help to the wider Indian Movement.

5. Lastly, though a purely political Movement, it has a sound ethical basis. Without harming any body's legitimate interests, it is calculated to help Hyderabad to gain its legitimate ends.

I do not claim that in trying to expound the principles underlying the creed of the proposed Nizam's Subjects' League, I have done full justice to my theme. Abler hands than mine should have undertaken it. Any way, they are presented here for what they are worth. If this humble contribution succeeds in drawing people's atten-

tion to the problems that are awaiting solution, I shall consider my poor efforts amply recompensed. It is high time that people began seriously to ponder over the problems of the State.

I beg to assure one and all that I have not compiled these pages for the mere pleasure of publishing a book. I sincerely believe that:

“ All is not well with this State, that things are not what they should be and can be and that some thing must be and can be done or undone to improve the existing state of affairs ”.

It is with this conviction and, in the spirit of a true, loyal and devoted Hyderabadí, that I have jotted down my thoughts in the fervent hope that they will be of some use in furthering the cause which is so dear to the hearts of all of us.

In writing this book I have been greatly handicapped by the paucity and inaccessibility of proper reference books and records. Persons more advantageously situated in this respect than I am will, I hope, devote their time and attention to completing the picture of which I have given the barest outline.

Nothing that I have written in the following pages, should be understood to mean that I am either explicitly or implicitly preaching disaffection

or hostility towards any party or institution. The Mulki Movement is a self-help and self-development movement and one can surely help oneself without harming any body or without being hostile or antagonistic to anybody. That is the spirit in which every line of the succeeding pages should be understood and interpreted.

A word in conclusion—if any of the facts or views presented herein are found by closer scrutiny to be incorrect, I would appeal to my indulgent readers to place the correct side of things before the public. I would then have the consolation that I was indirectly responsible for the emergence of truth.

Red Hills,  
Hyderabad—Deccan,  
India,

S. A. H.

*15th January, 1935.*

“ It is apparent that from first to last a retrospect of our relations with the Nizam should be carefully avoided by resolute sticklers for the perfection of British rule. Few chapters of its history, it is to be hoped, are so calculated to tax either the credulity of its devotees or the versatile audacity of hirelings ”.

—COL. HASTING FRASER,  
in his pamphlet entitled  
“ The Claims of the Nizam ”



## **A CIRCULAR.**

### **Need for An All-Hyderabad Mulki Organisation**

**Wanted Constructive & Helpful Suggestions.**

Dear Sir,

It is generally felt that an organisation, representative of all classes and communities in Hyderabad should be formed to keep alive the enthusiasm created by the Mulki Movement and to utilise it for healthy and constitutional purposes.

But before any such organisation is created, it is essential to determine what exactly it will stand for, what its outlook will be towards the various internal and external problems that confront us today; in short, what will be the creed of the organisation. That determined, the immediate objectives of the organisation will have to be formulated and the organisation brought into being.

To enable the sponsors of the Mulki Movement to formulate the creed and the objects of the Association, a draft is submitted herewith for their careful scrutiny and expression of views and criticisms, so that a final draft may subsequently be prepared and approved in a regular meeting.

As some of our best brains happen to be in State service, it will be very unfortunate, if on that account, they refrain from helping us with their views. In their private and individual capacities they can surely offer useful and helpful advice and criticism. We, therefore, hope that Government officials will also enlighten us with their views and fulfil their obligations towards this healthy and constitutional movement conceived in the best interests of the sovereign and the State.

Almost every one of us feels that all is not well with this State, that things are not what they should be and can be and that something must be and can be done or undone to improve the existing state of affairs. Do let us know what exactly you mean by 'Something' and help us to form an organisation for that purpose.

The proposed organisation is, for the purpose of this circular, tentatively named "THE NIZAM'S SUBJECTS LEAGUE."

Yours faithfully,

(Sd.) (Miss) Padmaja Naidu.

(Sd.) Abdul Hasan Syed Ali.

(Sd.) B. Ramkishan Rao B.A., LL.B.

(Sd.) S. B. Sharma, Bar-at-Law.

(Sd.) Syed Abid Hasan.

## Suggested creed of

### THE NIZAM'S SUBJECTS' LEAGUE.

1. This league declares its unflinching loyalty to the Asaf Jahi House and believes that the desire of the people of the Indian States to maintain intact the princely order in all its dignity and prestige is not inconsistent with their desire to rise to their full stature as a self-respecting & liberty-loving people.

2. This league believes that the preservation of the aristocracy, the Samasthans and Jagirs as historical & cultural entities need not constitute an impediment in the path of the people's progress. Members of this class can be a great source of strength to the State as a political entity and add considerably to its prestige and dignity. They are expected to be imbued with the ideals of service and sacrifice—service of the people and sacrifice, if need be, for the sake of the throne.

3. This league declares that the privilege of serving the State, the privilege of profiting by the economic resources of the State and the privilege of shaping the administrative policies of the State belongs to the sons of the soil, otherwise known

as ' Mulkis,' who should, among themselves, have fair and equal opportunities of service without distinction of caste or creed.

4. This league declares that all Hyderabad-ees are equal in the eyes of law, that all Hyderabad-ees should enjoy the full rights of citizenship-security of person and property, freedom of thought, of speech, of the press, freedom to perform one's religious obligations and that the executive should be made responsible to a legislature, fully representative of the various interests in the State in such a way that no class or community as such is in a position to dominate over the rest. This league believes in the supremacy of a judiciary independent of the executive.

5. This league believes that the canker of communalism that is eating into the vitals of the Indian body politic, should not be allowed to take root in our State, & lays down as an article of its faith that progress of the State is only possible on the lines of united Deccani Nationalism without distinction of caste, creed or sex-all striving for the best interests of the sovereign and the State.

6. This league believes that in order to promote the cause of Deccani Nationalism and

Indian Federalism, Hindustani (the lingua franca of India) should be encouraged and fostered as the common language of Hyderabad.

7. This league declares, that the economic regeneration of this state can only come through rapid industrialisation. It views with alarm the growing indebtedness of the peasantry and the lower middle classes..

8. This league believes that the treaties of the Hyderabad State are with His Majesty's Government in British India and not with the British Crown and that any change in the constitution or personnel of the Government of British India need cause no misgivings to the Hyderabad State so far as its treaty rights and privileges are concerned. The relationship being purely contractual, the mutual rights and obligations flowing from those treaties and the exact nature of the relationship so established can only be ascertained by reference to legal principles.

9. This league believes that Hyderabad possesses all sovereign powers, except those that have willingly, explicitly and formally been transferred to the East India Company or its successor the Government of British India. The word 'paramountcy' may be used to describe the

obligations of the Government of British India, which arise out of the agreed cession by Hyderabad of certain attributes of its sovereignty. This league whole-heartedly and unreservedly endorses the claim of His Exalted Highness in his famous letter to Lord Reading viz:—

“ Save and except matters relating to foreign powers and policies, the Nizams of Hyderabad have been independent in the internal affairs of their State, just as much as the British Government in British India. With the reservation mentioned by me, the two parties have on all occasions acted with complete freedom and independence in all inter-Governmental questions that naturally arise from time to time between neighbours.”

10. This league believes that Federation is the right solution of the Indian problem and that Hyderabad must join it to share the responsibility for the good Government of a united Indian Empire. In joining the Federation, Hyderabad should steer clear of all suspicion that she is doing anything against the best interests of India or is retarding the progress of the country towards its cherished goal of a full-fledged Dominion status. Hyderabad should not jeopardise its own sovereignty and privileges but if entry into the Federal scheme makes sacrifices inevitable, she should agree to none that is not demonstrably in the interests of a United India.

## **Suggested Aims and Objects of the Proposed League.**

1. To promote goodwill and cooperation between the various classes and communities that owe allegiance to the Nizam of Hyderabad.

2. To safeguard the constitutional rights and privileges of Hyderabad as a sovereign State.

3. To secure and safeguard the fundamental rights and privileges of citizenship in Hyderabad and to strive for the establishment of a constitutional form of Government under the aegis of the Asaf Jahi dynasty.

4. To propagate the creed of the Association and to secure the widest possible support for the same.

P. S.

The Urdu equivalent of the "NIZAM'S SUBJECTS' LEAGUE," would be 'JAMIAT-E-RIAYA-E-NIZAM"





## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. Preface      ...                      ...	...
2. Creed of "the Nizam's Subject's League"      ...	...
3. Chapter I. Meaning of Loyalty      ...	1
4. Chapter II. The Role of the classes      ...	17
5. Chapter III. Our rights and privileges      ...	34
6. Chapter IV. Responsible Government      ...	50
7. Chapter V. Deccani Nationalism      ...	59
8. Chapter VI. Our common language      ...	71
9. Chapter VII. Economic Regeneration      ...	73
10. Chapter VIII. Our relations with the Govern- ment of British India      ...	103
11. Chapter IX. Our constitutional position      ...	115
12. Chapter X. Federation      ...	141
13. Post Script      ...                      ...	150
14. Appendix I. A Suggested Constitutional Scheme for Hyderabad      ...	152
15. Appendix II. Mulki Movement in Hyderabad (What it stands for)      ...	159
16. Appendix III. Ethics and politics of the Mulki Movement      ...                      ...	166
17. Appendix IV. An appeal to Hyderabad Muslims      ...                      ...	178





## CHAPTER I.

### Meaning of Loyalty.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subject's League.

Clause I.

“ This League declares its unflinching loyalty to the Asaf Jahi House and believes that the desire of the people of the Indian States to maintain intact the princely order in all its dignity and prestige is not inconsistent with their desire to rise to their full stature as a self-respecting and liberty-loving people.”

This clause has very rightly and deserved-ly secured the first place in the creed of the League. Expression of loyalty to the Asaf Jahi Dynasty is not a mere platitude as some people imagine : nor is there anything servile about it. It is a very significant and solemn declaration.

It is not a mere expression of our desire that the Asaf Jahi Flag should continue to fly over our heads, however advanced and progressive we may become; it does not merely mean that we shall uphold the traditions of our forefathers in matters

of Darbar etiquette and the dignity of our rulers; the most important implication of our declaration of loyalty is that :—

We, the people of Hyderabad, with our political consciousness sufficiently developed and with the fullest realisation of the trend of events around us, do hereby resolve that the Dominions of our sovereign shall continue to be a political unit in the Commonwealth of India.

Hyderabad, as is well-known, consists of different peoples, both linguistically and from the point of view of castes and tribes. Before the advent of the Asaf Jahi Dynasty, the Deccan was, as it were, a kind of hunting ground for ambitious Rajas and Sultans of all sorts, each warring with the other and thus depriving the people of the Deccan of the peace and quiet so essential for their development. When the Great Moghal Empire began to disintegrate, Asaf Jah the First came, saw and conquered and, what is more, established comparative peace in the land that for centuries past had been hungering for it. History tells us that the advent of the Asaf Jahi Dynasty ultimately proved a blessing for the Deccan, as blessings went in those days. What followed is, of course, known to every student of history.

Asaf Jahi Rule—  
A Blessing.

But the point that is missed and ignored is that if the Asaf Jahi Rulers could show no better record of their custodianship than what they have done, it was, to a large extent, due to the fact that they were too gentlemanly and confiding to be able to check the machinations of the party with which they had contracted an alliance, with the result that the benevolent intentions of the Nizams to serve their subjects and to build up a healthy and prosperous kingdom were always thwarted by the very people who had bargained not to interfere in our affairs.

The History of Hyderabad is but a chain of these sad events. It can be proved to the hilt that the responsibility for a good many of the evils that our State has unfortunately become heir to, can be traced to a hand that could smite a blow without getting the blame for it.

It might be said with plausible justification that a dynasty that could not save Hyderabad from the demoralising and baneful effects of external intervention can have no claim on our loyalty. Critics forget that, while it is true that the Asaf Jahi Rulers could not resist

Nizams not wholly responsible for the State's troubles.

How princes have served Indian Nationalism

foreign encroachment with all its concomitant evils, they yet have performed one great national service to India and the Deccan for which the people can never be too grateful to them; and that is that **they saved Hyderabad and its people from passing into foreign hands and from being completely subjugated by them.** I believe that this was real national service and, looked at from this point of view, every prince is a potential national hero. No wonder Mahatma Gandhi has a soft corner in his heart for princedom. If, for no other blessings, at least for this, the people of Hyderabad should be grateful to Asaf Jah and his descendants. **They kept the throne safe from foreign occupants.** Let us not forget this.

Another reason why we should be grateful and loyal to our rulers is that, in the kingdom that they built up in the Deccan, they brought together different elements and merged into one composite whole, thus sowing the seeds of nationalism in this part of India. The benefit that this process of nationalisation has conferred on the Deccan can be better realised if we imagine for a moment what would have happened if the cementing influence of the Asaf Jahi Rule had not operated in this land. The Marathi speaking portion of the Dominions would

Another service to  
motherland.

probably have been just a part of the other Marathi speaking areas in the Western Presidency. Similarly the Telugu speaking portion of our Dominions would probably have formed an insignificant part of the Andhra Desa, and so on. Thus the development of a Common Culture and a common language—two essentials of nationalism—that has been the happy result of the fusion brought about by the Asaf Jahi Rulers, would not have come about. Who can deny that this was real national service ?

It is quite natural that people who have stuck  
 A Natural and Legitimate Desire. together, through good and evil,  
 for the past two centuries and more under the same rule, people who are the proud inheritors of a common culture and common historical traditions should resolve to remain wedded, with a desire further to develop the products of their fusion—common culture, common language, and common traditions—to their fullest stature with a view to attaining the goal of nationalism.

It is very reasonable, too, that the subjects of the Nizam, irrespective of their linguistic and communal differences, should long to maintain intact the political unit of Hyderabad, because, if they decided otherwise, they would be setting back the

hands of the clock, and would be retarding the process of assimilation and nationalisation.

As Col. K. N. Hakser and Mr. K. M. Pannikar observe in their book entitled *Federal India*, "The insistence of Indian States on individual autonomy is only a manifestation of 'regional particularism.' Assuming that Hyderabad and Mysore could be abolished, they would still want to be separate provinces and to govern themselves as Sindh and Andhra wish to be and to do, even though they have for so long been parts of larger administrative units."

It will thus be seen that our expression of loyalty with all its implications, is not a verbal homage paid to an oriental monarch by his docile subjects but is a well-considered and genuine desire of a politically - mature people, spontaneously expressed, and a desire having a historical and cultural back-ground.

It is very significant and praiseworthy that the alleged shortcomings—past and present—of the Asaf Jahi Rulers have not in the slightest degree affected the intensity of the people's loyalty to the throne. This is, as it should be. It only shows that the people of Hyderabad can see things in their true

Outsiders' exploits  
in Hyderabad.

perspective. The charge that the Asaf Jahi Rulers have not been able to do for the people all that the people needed and deserved cannot be laid solely on the shoulders of our Rulers. It is foreign meddlers and their agents, both Mulki and Non-Mulki, who have been largely responsible for most of our troubles. The people of Hyderabad are clever enough to realise this fact and hence they do not allow it to dim their sense of loyalty to their Rulers.

Strong and invincible evidence can be adduced to prove that outsiders, and not the Nizams, gambled away the wealth and welfare of the people in pursuance of their own designs. I shall quote here just two confessions, out of many, of persons well acquainted with Hyderabad affairs.

Two Significant  
Confessions.

In one of his letters to the Government of India in 1834, Col. Stewart, Resident at Hyderabad, wrote thus:—

Who is responsible  
for State's troubles?

“Those who have witnessed the course of our policy at this Court for the last thirty years, who have seen how we put up creatures of our own as Ministers, and supported them against their sovereign; how we have obtained the control of all the effective troops, and how we assumed the civil

control of the country, can hardly feel a doubt, least of all can the Nizam himself, that we have considered ourselves as the actual Rulers of the country. **Many of the evils that exist in the State are unquestionably the almost unavoidable result of the anomalous nature of our connection with it.** It seems hardly fair, therefore, to hold either the Nizam or his Minister responsible for the evil. Situated as they are, I do not think that they had the power to correct them. In fact, we may, perhaps, more properly be regarded as responsible for them, having the power in our hands to remedy them, and having shown that we are no ways scrupulous about making use of that power when we think fit to do so."

The following is an extract from Sir Charles Metcalfe's Minute :—

“ We never conquered the Nizam's territories. Our relation with that Prince has always been one of alliance, and his alliance was once held to be of so much importance, that the officer who negotiated the treaty establishing it, was rewarded with a Baronetcy. Since that period we have assumed much interference in that country not warranted by any of our treaties. We affected the elevation o f

Unwarranted Inter-  
ference and its  
results.

a Minister, who, emboldened by our support, ceased to be the Minister of his own Sovereign, and became, in fact the reckless ruler of the country. Our extended interference then became necessary to remedy the mischiefs created by our former interference."

It would have been a short-sighted policy, and positively unfair to the Rulers, if in the face of the evidence that History provides, the people had laid the entire blame for the State's troubles on the shoulders of the successive Nizams.

By their declaration of unflinching loyalty, the sponsors of the Nizam's Subjects' League have shown that they are not blind to facts, that they fully realise the difficulties with which the Rulers of Hyderabad have always been surrounded, and that they will see to it that their Rulers shall no longer remain enmeshed in the difficulties that outsiders would naturally, for their own reasons, like to spread around them.

Nizam's Subjects  
League Makes a  
Resolve.

Expression of loyalty would be a mere sham if it were not backed up by deeds. The League expects every self-respecting and true Mulki to be actively loyal to his sovereign; sense of loyalty to the State should not desert him, when the in-

terests and prestige of the State conflict with those of any party, however strong and "Paramount." In other words, our loyalty should not be halting, there should be no limits to it, and it should be no respecter of the State's opponents. No sacrifice should be too great for us, when there is a call for it, in virtue of our declaration of loyalty.

Be it clearly understood that loyalty to Rulers is not inconsistent with the desire of the subjects to rise to their full stature as a self respecting and liberty-loving people.

Two instances will suffice to prove the validity of this claim. Britain is intensely loyal to her king and yet she is one of the most advanced nations of the world. Japan worships her Emperor, and can any one say that Japan is not progressive? Hyderabad can make all the progress that she wants under the aegis of the Asaf Jahi Dynasty. None can prevent that, and least of all, would the ruling dynasty.

It is a piece of good fortune that our Rulers have without exception been really benevolent and well-intentioned. Loyalty, therefore, is all the more due to them. It is certainly not blind or over-zealous.

Nizams Stand for  
Progress.

An Appeal to  
Subjects of Indian  
States.

A word now in general to all  
the subjects of the Indian Princes!

Even if your Rulers do not happen to be benevolent and well-meaning, your attitude towards them should be one of tolerance. Because if you refuse to tolerate your bad Rulers, foreigners will take advantage of the conflict and inflict themselves on you and your State by hook or crook.

The first and primary consideration of every nationalist subject of an Indian Prince should be to keep foreign influences as far away from his State as is possible under the existing treaties. Because the closer your contact with foreigners and the greater their influence in the affairs of your State, the lower sinks the Constitutional position of the State and the more are you a loser in respect of that priceless asset called national independence. If, by refusing to tolerate a bad Ruler, you invite the disaster of foreign interference in your affairs, then, for God's sake, put up with the worst tyrant. But if you can curb the evil propensities of your Rulers without giving the outsider the chance to extend his own tentacles in the State, by all means do it. There is nothing wrong, unconstitutional or immoral about it. But

in order to save yourself some hardship, do not lower the prestige and the constitutional position of the State. That would be a political crime of the worst kind.

We must remember that the Ruler of an Indian State is not a person but an institution—an institution that embodies all that is good, great and glorious in that State. The national independence of the State will be judged by the extent to which the Ruler himself is independent of foreign control. Do not, therefore, jeopardise the national independence of your State (or what little is left of it) by inviting foreign intervention. If you cannot set right your own affairs, bide your time but do not seek the aid of foreigners.

Recently, there have been some cases, when aggrieved parties have sought the intervention of the Government of British India against the alleged vagaries of certain Princes (Vide the cases of Alwar and Kashmir). I entirely disapprove of the conduct of such State Subjects as were hasty and foolish enough to seek foreign intervention. To begin with, I wish to ask them why should they need anybody's help at all to set right their own affairs. If they must seek

Lesson from Alwar  
and Kashmir  
Tragedies.

Anti-National.

somebody's aid, why particularly that of the Government of British India? Constitutionally speaking, the said Government has no *Locus-standi* in the internal affairs of treaty States.

Secondly, is it not anti-national to seek the aid of outside agencies against your own Rulers? If you cannot set right matters on your own account, then wait till you develop sufficient strength to do so. But never give the outsider the chance to profit by your weakness.

Loyalty to the Institution of Indian princedom, therefore, involves a good deal of self-restraint. Even if the person who represents that institution—I mean the Ruler—gives you enough cause to feel aggrieved and provokes you to retaliate, still do not be in a hurry, do not be led away by angry passions, but think coolly and calmly how you can stop further mischief without harming the political integrity of the State. That is loyalty.

There are people, though few in number, who would like to see the Indian States done away with. To such, our polite submission is that the Indian States, in the words of Mr. Pannikar:—

Why should states  
be preserved?

“Add greatly to the richness and variety of India’s National Life and fill a position which has politically and culturally a value of its own……. The States and the Rulers have been custodians of our cultural and artistic traditions in a degree that we cannot appreciate now. In the midst of a changing and disintegrating society, the states have in many cases preserved the solidarity of the social structure and kept in tact the imperceptible bonds that unite classes and castes into one community. Moreover, to a large extent, the states have served the cause of India’s civilisation by acting as a refuge of certain valuable forms of intellectual activity, which through one circumstance or another, could not find adequate support in British India. Specially in the development of the vernaculars through which alone, can education ever reach the mass mind of India, the States and their Governments have rendered a common service. The Nizam’s Government has founded a University in which the course of Instruction is entirely in Urdu. The encouragement given by the Mysore University to Canarese and by Travancore to Malayalam has gone a great way in modernising these languages.”

In an address to the Royal Institution, London in March 1914, Sir Walter Lawrence speaking on the problem of Indian States, said:—

A Britisher's  
testimony.

“During my twenty one years of life in India, I was always comparing the conditions in Indian States with the conditions prevailing in British India and I am of the opinion that the people in Indian States are happier and more contented than are their brethren over the Border in British territory. They have a Government more congenial, more in accordance with their own ideas, in short, a Government that is Indian. If I were an Indian, I should most certainly elect to live in an Indian State.”

There neither is, nor can there ever be anything intrinsically or inherently wrong with the Institutions of Princedom or Indian States. Baroda, Travancore and Mysore, among the Indian States have been and are administered in such a manner that the people of those territories need hardly be ashamed of their Governments. If, unfortunately, for us, Hyderabad cannot be classed with these three States, it is because outside influences and agencies have seen to it that Hyderabad does not

go ahead. I shall have more to say about this in succeeding chapters.

But one thing must be made clear here—I mean the definition of the term ‘Nizam’.

Loyalty to Nizam is  
loyalty to Mulki  
Interests.

The Nizam is an institution that embodies the sovereignty of the people of Hyderabad, whose national independence will be judged by the extent to which the Nizam himself is free from foreign control. The Nizam is the ruler of Hyderabad, not because other Governments regard him as such, but because the people of Hyderabad have declared him to be such. That he will be from among the descendants of Asaf Jah is a tradition that the people of Hyderabad will religiously uphold. Loyalty to the person and institution of the Nizam, therefore, means people's loyalty to their own interests, to their own political integrity; in short, to themselves. Loyalty to the Nizam is another term for loyalty to Mulki Interests.



## CHAPTER II.

### The Role of the Classes.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' League.

Clause II.

This league believes that the preservation of the aristocracy, the Samasthans and Jagirs as historical and cultural entities need not constitute an impediment in the path of the people's progress. Members of this Class can be a great source of strength to the State as a political entity and add considerably to its prestige and dignity. They are expected to be imbued with the ideals of service and sacrifice—service of the people and sacrifice, if need be, for the sake of the throne."

The inclusion of this clause in the creed of the League was necessary.  
How can Jagirdars save themselves? Socialism is in the air just now.

I do not propose to discuss its merits or demerits, because the occasion for doing so has not arisen in Hyderabad. But it is possible that Socialism (preached as it generally is, in a crude form, divested of all its humane and benevolent

implications) may catch the imagination of the immature and uninitiated minds amongst us and thus upset the social fabric. . It was this lurking fear that prompted the sponsors of the Nizam's Subject's League to give a gentle hint to the holders of Samastans and Jagirs as to how best they could save their class from Socialistic onslaughts and ensure its undisturbed existence. Socialism is provoked by the high-handed, callous and unsympathetic behaviour of the well - to - do classes and it thrives on the helplessness and discontent of the masses. If the Samasthans, Paigahs and Jagirs of all denominations do not provoke socialism by their behaviour and if they remove all causes of genuine discontent from among the people under their care, then it may reasonably be hoped that this class will be able to prolong its life in Hyderabad.

The chances of this class saving itself from extinction are comparatively greater in Hyderabad, because Hyderabadis are a sentimental people and it would be a great wrench to them to feel that a class to which they have paid respect for more than a century and a half is now, by its behaviour, paving the way for its own annihilation. Otherwise, left to themselves, and given no cause or provoca-

tion for any drastic measure, the people of Hyderabad would never vote against the Rajas, Nobles, and Jagirdars of this place.

This clause very significantly says that  
 “the preservation of the aristocracy, the Samasthans and Jagirs  
 as historical and cultural entities  
 need not constitute an impediment in the path  
 of the peoples’ progress.” Mark the words  
 “Need not.” The implication, obviously, is that  
 the classes named might and can constitute impediments in the path of the peoples’ progress. This is not an unfair assumption, because there are black sheep in every flock, and such do constitute real obstacles in the path of a nation’s progress. But the league rightly assumes that the mere fact of a person being born a nobleman or Jagirdar or the heir to a Samasthan need not necessarily mean that he is inconsiderate, callous or unmindful of the weal and happiness of the people entrusted to his guardianship.

If members of this class behave themselves as they should and do not consider their holdings as their personal property but look upon them as a trust ; if they safeguard the interests of the people under their care and keep a limited and reason-

able privy purse, giving up all extravagances, then and then only can these people be a “source of strength to the State as a political entity and add considerably to its prestige and dignity”.

Mulkies, of all shades of opinion and of all classes and creeds, do really want that this class should live in all its dignity and be a source of strength to the State. I assert that there is not a single Mulki of any importance who would like to end this class. There are thousands and thousands, I know full well, who would like to mend this class. And the League, by including this very important clause in its creed, has merely endorsed the attitude of the people of Hyderabad towards this class.

Before I discuss the last sentence in this clause viz : “They are expected to be imbued with the ideals of service and sacrifice—service of the people and sacrifice, if need be, for the sake of the throne”, let me state briefly how this class came into existence in Hyderabad. History tells us that land grants were awarded either for some conspicuous services rendered or to maintain the State and dignity of the grantees, so that having

How the classes  
came into Existence.

been freed from the cares of earning a livelihood, they might devote their time, energy and influence to promoting peace and progress among the people and keep themselves in readiness to render help to their sovereign and the State, in case the prestige and integrity of the latter were threatened.

The Paigahs, for instance, were given Jagirs for the maintenance of troops. The condition of military service is no longer in force now. But does it mean that the Paigahs can render no other service to the State? Are there no other fields left in which they can make themselves useful to the State and shine as heroes, thus keeping up the traditions of the famous Tegh Jung?

The Nizams have very often been confronted with situations which called forth their nobles' and ministers' steadfast loyalty and devotion. In the diplomatic fields, our Rulers have always stood in need of sincere advisers and self-sacrificing adherents. Here are fields and here are occasions for our Paigah nobleman to play their part and repay the debt of gratitude to their benevolent sovereign and Royal Kinsman. We know cases in which members of the Paigah family—Nawab Bashiruddowlah, for instance—have risen

to the occasion and justified the trust and esteem in which this family has been held both by the rulers and the ruled. But there have been lapses and cases of default too, in the life History of this family. Let us, however, bury the past, and, remembering only the bright spots in the record of their doings, expect and hope that our Paigah Noblemen will become the real pillars of strength to the ruling family and the State.

Take any other kind of Jagir, whether it is an Altamgha Jagir, Zat Jagir, Tankha Jagir, Mashrooti Jagir or Madad Mash Jagir, the idea of the grant has, in all cases, been to maintain the State and dignity of the grantees so that they might serve the people and keep themselves in readiness to sacrifice themselves, when and if necessary, for the benefit of the State.

I do not say that no Jagirdar has lived up to this ideal. There have been some glorious examples in the history of this class but, alas!, all were not and are not imbued with this high ideal. It would be invidious to mention by name Jagirdars whose loyalty, devotion and spirit of sacrifice have been exemplary. One shining example of a progressive and conscientious administrator and

The Role of Jagirdars.

reformer among the premier Jagirdars of the State is that of the Late Nawab Mukhtarul Mulk Bahadur (Sir Salar Jung) whose achievements are known to every student of History. There have been several other Jagirdars who have done yeoman service to the State but one wishes that all were of that type. It can be proved to the hilt that a good many of the Jagirdars were unworthy of the trust and favours bestowed on them by the Rulers. But let us forgive and forget. The League expects that at least the present generation will give no cause to the future historian to record that there were defaulters and traitors even among the present enlightened members of the Jagirdar class.

The Role of a Jagirdar in this State is fairly clear. He must administer his Jagir humanely and benevolently with the fullest regard for the well-being and progress of the people under his care. He must remember that he and he alone is responsible before God, Nizam and the State for the welfare of the people entrusted to his guardianship. He cannot and should not shirk his responsibility for his failures by pleading that his "Motamad", "Nazim", "Mukhtar" or "Nayeb" was guilty of a particular sin of omission or commission.

That part of his duty duly fulfilled, the rest of his time, he must devote to promoting causes of public welfare.

In this connection I wish to express my own personal view viz: that I do not think it is fair and proper for a Jagirdar to hanker after posts in the Dewani because by so doing not only does he deprive his Jagir affairs of the attention that is due to them, but he also deprives a deserving Mulki non-jagirdar of the opportunity of profiting by the State service. If it is a case of a Jagirdar versus an outsider, I would vote for the Jagirdar. But if it is a case of a Jagirdar versus any other Mulki, I expect the Jagirdar himself to make room for his less fortunate compatriot.

The case of "Hissedars" and other minor "Mashdars" stands in a different category. If they must supplement their incomes, and if no other walks of life are open to them (such as the liberal professions, trade, industry, contracts etc.,) then and then alone would they be justified in seeking Government service. But a preferable course for them would be to devote their time and labour to the development of their own Jagirs.

Should Jagirdars  
enter Government  
Service?

A word about sacrifice and I am done. It might be wondered what chances there are for this noble trait of character to find expression in our times. In the good old days, a nobleman, a Jagirdar or a Jamadar of the Nazam-e-jamiat could display his spirit of sacrifice by fighting for his country on battlefields, by putting down rebels or quelling disturbances. Today, happily for the country, such contingencies do not arise. How then can the grantees of the Jagirs, Mansabs, Mukhtas and Watans prove their mettle and win laurels? It is true that ostentatious display of loyalty is not possible in these days. There are no chances of winning the applause of the populace and approbation of the Ruler, by cutting off a rebel's head and galloping triumphantly with the head stuck on your spear.

But there are still chances, more serious though less spectacular for this favoured class to repay their debt of gratitude to their masters and prove their loyalty and spirit of sacrifice.

“Our Master, right or wrong” should be their slogan. Stand by your Sovereign, irrespective of the consequences; no matter whom you displease.

Our Master—right  
or wrong.

What does the sove-  
reign expect from  
Jagirdars?

Have no truck with those who wish to belittle the prestige of your Sovereign and country. There might be parties willing to bribe you, ready to offer all sorts of rewards, if you only consent to betray your master or make it easy for the outsider to get the better of him. Spurn such offers with the contempt they deserve and let your beguilers know that nothing on earth can shake your loyalty and induce you to go against the best interests of your State. Stand up like a rock, firm and unshakable, against all such overtures and never enter into any intrigue or conspiracy, because all intrigues ultimately benefit the outsider who is only too willing and eager to take unfair advantage of the petty jealousies and rivalries amongst you. In short, let no advantage, howsoever great that you can acquire for yourself, for your class or for your community, induce you to harm the political integrity of the State and the Constitutional position of your monarch.

I do not wish to make myself more clear by  
 Survey your own giving concrete illustrations of  
 things that have happened and  
 things that should not have happened. I only wish that the spirit of sacrifice that made other nations great, had permeated the rank and file of

such of our people as had it in their power to save Hyderabad from the degradation which has been its lot. Let all noble men, Jagirdars and other privileged Mulkies make a quiet retrospective and introspective survey of their own family histories and think for themselves whether they or their ancestors have ever been guilty of any sin of omission or commission against the very hand that has been feeding them all along. Who knows some of you might come to the doleful conclusion that if you or your ancestors had acted in a particular way, Berar might still have been a part of the Nizam's Dominions or the Nizam himself might have been the same independent Ruler that His Royal ancestors were?

There are people, I know, who proclaim their loyalty to our Sovereign from the house tops and sometimes even from the public platform and through the Public Press. But when occasions arise for their professions to be put to the acid test of demonstration, they disguise their lack of loyalty and take refuge behind such platitudes as "Sacrifice at this stage is inexpedient, inadvisable, uncalled for" and the like. They will argue with you for hours and write columns after columns and

Traitors in the Garb  
of loyalists.

conceal their unpreparedness for sacrifice behind tons of meaningless verbiage. But sacrifice, they will not do.

If their professions of loyalty were from their hearts and not their tongues, no call for sacrifice would have gone unheeded. The argument that, in the cause of truth and justice and for the sake of Sovereign and country, sacrifice can only be performed at particular times and under special circumstances, is pure bunkum and balderdash. Every sacrifice, made in the right cause, has its value, irrespective of time, place, and circumstances. If the spirit of sacrifice is there, the time for its use can be brought as near as you please, and circumstances can be made as favourable as you like.

I must be pardoned for putting a straight question. Who amongst you does  
 A straight question. not feel humiliated and grieved because your sovereign does not enjoy the powers and prestige to which he is entitled under the treaties? But how many of you are willing and prepared to declare publicly your heart's innermost grief, knowing full well, as you do, that such a declaration would put you on the black list of the Residency? More I shall not say.

The League expects all Jagirdars, Samastans and Noblemen to be truly loyal to their Sovereign and country and not deceive themselves and the country by merely paying lip homage. That is what the league expects and it will be satisfied with nothing less.

A young Jagirdar friend tells me that there is an impression amongst the elders of his class that they are not expected or allowed to dabble in politics. Without looking into the terms on which Jagirs were granted, I feel disposed to dismiss this fear, if it really exists, as utterly groundless. If it is a mere pretext for keeping on the warm side of the people whose interests are at variance with those of our Sovereign, then no words can be too strong to condemn this moral cowardice and disguised hypocrisy. The Jagirdars are surely not expected to intrigue against the best interests of the Sovereign and State and hobnob with those whose strength lies in the weakness of our Ruler.

But no law, statute or convention can ever prevent them from sacrificing themselves for the sake of the throne and the country. It would be very queer logic indeed if, when I am asked not to harm my

Jagirdars and politics.

A sheer misunderstanding.

benefactor, I should interpret it as an order asking me not to help him. This is a piece of reasoning inadmissible alike in law, equity, and morality, more so in cases where the party refusing help is under the deepest obligation, in fact, owes its existence to the party to whom help and support is being denied. Let the Jagirdars, therefore, be under no such delusion.

There is another very important point that I wish to urge in respect of Jagirdars. They cannot and should not claim to have a separate existence, as distinguished from the other subjects of the Nizam, so far as the Government of British India is concerned. They cannot claim to be an entity by themselves in the eyes of the Residency nor claim recognition as such. In other words, just as I, a humble subject of the Nizam, recognise none except my Sovereign and his Government ; just as I, an ordinary citizen of Hyderabad, consider it a crime and a sin to approach the Resident or the Viceroy for the redress of my grievances, if any, so also I expect the nobles or Jagirdars to recognise none except the Nizam as their overlord. The mere fact that a certain class of people has been generously treated by the Nizam does

Don't knock at  
wrong doors.

not give that class the right to knock at wrong doors for the redress of their grievances ; no matter how strong the reasons that might be adduced in favour of such a procedure. I simply cannot reconcile myself to the view that in order to save myself some inconveniences or embarrassment or in order to have some grievance redressed or wrong righted, I should invoke outside intervention.

I recall with disgust and indignation that there have been cases in which some of our nobles and Jagirdars have set the unholy precedent of seeking the aid of the British Authorities in setting some of their own affairs. The treaties lay it down specifically and clearly that the Government of British India (or the Paramount Power, as it likes to call itself) can have no direct dealings at all, with the subjects of the Nizam, his servants or his family. Yet, in defiance of the clear provisions of the treaty, interested parties have overtly or covertly encouraged some weak-minded nobles and Jagirdars of his State to seek outside help as against the Nizam. Those who yielded to such overtures have harmed the State.

Resident has no  
locus standi in  
Internal Affairs  
(Vide Treaties.)

If the people of Hyderabad have any value  
 for their own independence as a  
 political unit, they must do nothing  
 to impair that independence. The

Nizam Represents  
 Public Will.

Government of British India has nothing to do with the internal affairs of the State. If the nobles and Rajas have any dispute among themselves, the Nizam is their final arbiter. They are disloyal if they approach any other power, howsoever paramount. Those who think that the Government of British India or the Secretary of State is a sort of a Court of Appeal against the rulings of the Nizam are either fools or knaves. Every Raja, Nawab and Jagirdar must be made clearly to understand that the Nizam's word is final so far as they are concerned, that the Nizam can reward them or punish them according to certain well defined rules ; in short that the Nizam is the Sovereign ruler of Hyderabad and no one else.

If any subject of the Nizam is dissatisfied with  
 his master's ruling as being unjust  
 or unconstitutional or arbitrary, he  
 might test the said ruling in a Court of Law, if he  
 so chooses, just as the people of British India can  
 sue His Majesty's Secretary of State in any  
 British Court. But approaching foreigners for the

Supremacy of Law.

redress of internal grievances will neither be tolerated nor pardoned. Let that be understood clearly once for all.

I do not wish to belittle the rightful position that the Residency occupies in the State. I only wish to place things in their true perspective so that neither the Residency should abuse its influence and prestige nor should the people of the State take unfair advantage of the influence and prestige of His Majesty's Ambassador at the Court of the Nizam.



## CHAPTER III.

### Our Rights and privileges.

Creed of the Nizam's  
subjects' league.

#### Clause III.

"This League declares that the privileges of serving the State, the privileges of profiting by the economic resources of the State and the privilege of shaping the administrative policies of the State belongs to the sons of the soil, otherwise known as 'Mulkis;' who should, among themselves, have fair and equal opportunities of service without distinction of caste or creed."

This clause is a self-evident truth, and needs no arguments to support it.

An axiom.

Mulkies, who are foolish enough to doubt the righteousness and legitimacy of the claim put forward in this clause, forfeit their right to be called Mulkies. Outsiders have no business to question it. It is a fair and just demand and the people will have it.

One misunderstanding has to be cleared. When we talk of outsiders we make no distinction of caste, colour or creed. An outsider is an outsider. There is no **WHY** and **HOW** of it.

Those who have settled down here for good and identified themselves wholly with us and have enrolled themselves as subjects of our Royal Master shall not suffer in any way because of the Mulki movement. As for further importations, it is high time that they were definitely stopped; otherwise discontent among the people of Hyderabad will grow to such perilous proportions that it will be extremely difficult to keep it in check.

The question of unemployment in Hyderabad has become so acute that Government would do well to decide once for all that, under no circumstances, will they ever dream of importing an outside hand. Capable Mulkies can be found and ought to be found for every administrative and technical post. Government must look ahead and be in a position to calculate their future requirements.

If, for instance, you know that the posts of the Directors of the Medical, Agricultural or Educational Departments are going to fall vacant at the end of this year or the next, pick out a suitable Mulki and train him up for that post. Suppose you wish to confer on every Hyderabad village the benefits

Follow a "Look-ahead" policy.

of radio, wireless or Air Mail Services then send out suitable Mulkiies right now for training in these lines so that by the time your Scheme materialises you may have the services of trained Mulki technicians at your disposal.

By following, therefore, a "Look-ahead" policy it will always be possible for our Government to avert the disaster of importing an outsider and to spare Hyderabad the shame that her sons cannot serve her in particular capacities.

Another point the Government must pay heed to is that the practice of giving extensions to people who have outlived their utility is preventing young Mulki officials from rising to their full stature.

No more extensions.

Thirdly, all British Indian Officials whose services were borrowed or had to be borrowed must be spared the trouble of conferring the benefits of their "valuable" but unwelcome services on an "ungrateful" people. Mulkiies can be found in abundance to fill all those posts with credit to themselves and honour to their State. Even if they are found incompetent at the outset, give them the chance to profit by their failures and to learn by experience. Surely Mulkiies are human

beings and like all other human beings have a "right to make mistakes".

Take other walks of life such as contracts, monopolies, licenses, and agencies. All these economic resources must be in the hands of the Mulkies. Today things are just the reverse. Besides involving a perpetual drain of wealth, the present state of affairs deprives the sons of the soil of the only available means of earning a livelihood and thereby enhancing the economic wealth of the State.

When we talk in this strain, let not outsiders imagine that we are ill-disposed towards them. We are claiming our own birth right from our State. Who dare question the validity, righteousness and justice of our claim ? It is a case of children asking their parents to provide for their needs first, before spending money on feeding other people or giving it away in charities. Our needs must first be catered for. If you call that selfish, my reply is: such is the world and that is that.

In this connection, a few facts concerning the non-mulkies in Hyderabad taken from the Census Report of 1931, may not be out of place. There

Sheer injustice to  
mulkies.

2½ lakhs non-  
Mulkies in  
Hyderabad.

are 2,48,000 Non-Mulkies in our State out of whom nearly 5,000 are Europeans and 2,43,000 are Indians.

Out of the 2,43,000 Indian Non-Mulkies, 2,18,000 hail from the contiguous Provinces viz. Madras, Bombay, C. P. & Berar and Mysore, the contribution of each province being roughly as follows :—

Madras	....	1,33,000
Bombay	....	68,000
C. P. & Berar	....	14,000
Mysore	....	3,000
		<hr/>
		2,18,000

While 2,18,000 hail from the adjacent tracts, the balance of 25,000 comes from the distant provinces, the principal suppliers being:—

1. U. P. of Agra & Oudh	8,000
2. Rajputana Agency	6,000
3. The Punjab	4,000
4. Ajmere & Marwar	2,000
5. Other parts of India	5,000
	<hr/>
	25,000

“Nearly ninety per cent of Madras immigrants are found in the districts  
 Their occupations adjoining the Madras Presidency.

Hyderabad City has accounted for seventeen per cent of Madras born. The Railway offices and trade in Secunderabad are the Principal avenue of employment for them. There is also a large student population in schools and colleges and for that reason the proportion of male to female is 3 to 1. Warangal District has 22,692 persons belonging to Madras Presidency. The Singareni Mines and the irrigation Projects under construction account for a large number of Madrasis. Nalgonda adjoining Bezwada and Guntur Districts, has enumerated 10,364 Madras born, of whom only a fifth are women. The circumstances, under which Adilabad District has received such a large number as 52,412 with a sex ratio of 5 males to one female, it is difficult to guess.”

“Seventy seven per cent of Bombayites are found in the districts of Ma-  
 Bombay: rathwara adjacents to the Bombay Presidency, Osmanabad having the largest number of them. Eighteen percent have been enumerated in the city of Hyderabad and the rest

are scattered over the remaining Telingana Districts. The sex proportion of Bombay immigrants in Hyderabad is almost equal. In Marathwara Districts it varies: in the two mill districts of Aurangabad and Gulbarga and the cotton centre of Osmanabad female population is greater than that of male, pointing to the presence of large number of women, some as labourers and the others as wives having married men of their own race in these parts. In Adilabad District, 1829 persons of Bombay origin are found, men being twice as many as women."

"The proportion of male to female immigrants from C. P. & Berar is 10 to 6.  
C. P. and Berar.

Three thousands are found in the Hyderabad City and the rest mostly in the four districts adjacent to the Central Provinces viz. Aurangabad, Parbhani, Nanded & Adilabad. The presence in Aurangabad of twice as many females as there are males is a proof of the periodic labour movement to the cotton factories there. In the Adilabad District, the Bellampalli Collieries attract labourers from the Central Provinces."

"Among the Indian States, Mysore appears to have great affinity to Hyderabad. Sixty-two percent of Mysore-  
Mysore.

ians are to be found in the city of Hyderabad. The Cotton districts of Aurangabad and Osmana-bad have a large number of persons of Mysore birth. The ratio of 6 females to every 10 males suggests that they are a non-permanent population”.

“The flow of population between Hyderabad and Bombay on the one hand and  
 Distant Provinces. Hyderabad, Central Provinces and Berar and Madras on the other is characterised by two things; one is excess of immigration and the other is distribution of immigrants very largely in the Districts of the State, bordering the respective provinces. But the movement of the population between Hyderabad and three of the distant provinces viz. United Provinces of Agra & Oudh, the Punjab and Rajputana, is all the other way about. There is a larger volume of immigration than emigration and a pronounced concentration of the in-comers in the City of Hyderabad.

“Eighty three percent of the United Pro-  
 Service and Money Lending vinces immigrants to these Dom-  
 nions are to be found in the City.

“The natives of the Punjab enumerated in Hyderabad are 3,731. In the City limits, 2,882 have been counted. Business and

service in the public administrative departments are probably the principal attraction to the people of such distant provinces."

"The Rajputana Agency has contributed to Hyderabad 6,608 persons. Besides, Ajmere-Marwar has sent in 1,525. Nearly half of them are in the city. The natives of Rajputana found in the Dominions are very largely merchants and Bankers. They have established business in various parts of the country and as moneylenders some of them have vested interests to safeguard. Many of them are alone here, their women-folk being left at home. A third of the number of immigrants are in Hyderabad City and the rest are distributed in the cotton tracts of Marathwara, notably in Aurangabad District."

We are a home-loving people.

Commenting on the figures of migration, the Census Commissioner writes :—

"An analysis of the figures for migration between the State and the rest of India shows that the people of Hyderabad are more home-loving".

"Persons born in Hyderabad do not go north in search of employment but some are pilgrims of Benares and other such places and some are students of the Aligarh University and of the

Hindu University at Benares, while others may be regarded as on a visit to their relatives”.

From the above statistics and statements, it will be seen that a preponderating majority of the immigrants from the contiguous provinces viz. Madras, Bombay, Mysore, C. P. & Berar work in the State as field or factory labourers, a small percentage of them being engaged in trade or liberal professions. Bombayites are rarely attracted by service, but people, from Madras and Mysore form a fairly large proportion of the employees in the railways, public works, Audit and accounts and educational departments, besides being entertained in the commercial offices.

But the immigrants from U. P. and the Punjab are mostly those who come here to seek employment, thereby depriving educated Mulkies of an important means of earning a livelihood. Immigrants from Rajputana and Marwar come here as money lenders and trade on the poverty of the local people.

I have been asked by several well meaning critics, why do the Mulkies grudge the presence of Northern Indians the most ? The facts and figures

What do Statistics show.

The ways of the Northern Indians.

quoted above can provide some sort of an answer to this question. The main point is that because services in Hyderabad are manned mostly by Northern Indians these gentlemen have formed a sort of a caucus and a clique with a view to keep out the others from the administration. Secondly, they suffer from an unpardonable superiority complex which is most galling and irritating to the Mulkiies. If the Northern Indians had remained here as mere servants of the Government then the objection of the Mulkiies to their presence would have been purely for economic reasons. But, as it happens, though they are servants of the State they consider themselves rulers of the State.

That being so, what would otherwise have been a purely economic question has become a question of honour and self-respect, and self-respect for the people of Hyderabad who are determined, that they will have no undesirable and arrogant intermediaries between themselves and their sovereign. The Nizam must rule over his subjects directly without this vexatious intervention from abroad and without the unsolicited and unwanted advice of the Non-Mulki officials, who pose before our royal

A question of  
honour and self-  
respect,

master as his best well wishers, but who, in reality, have other masters to serve and please too.

When the Mulkies, therefore, claim the privilege of shaping the administrative policies of the State, all they mean is that theirs is the right to assist and advise their sovereign in running the administration and no one else's. Unreliable and selfish Non-Mulki advisers have wrought havoc to the State. It is time that the right type of the Mulkies are chosen as Ministers, Secretaries and Heads of Departments—Mulkies who besides being competent should be imbued with the ideals of service and sacrifice.

That is the crux of the Mulki demand about services.

In concluding this note I wish to refute a charge levelled against the Mulki movement by its detractors viz., that the movement aims at sacrificing merit and efficiency for the sake of a sentiment, because, they allege, preference to a people born within a specified area over those born outside that area can have some sentiment alone as its basis.

Mulki demand  
about services.

Baseless charge.

vants were known as "Nafars" and sensitive Hyderabadis of those days were most reluctant to be styled as "Nafar" instead of "Bashar." This unfortunate tendency of the then Mul kies was the principal cause of the Non-Mulki invasion and the subsequent capture by them of the entire administrative machinery. Mul kies of the present day would accept an even lesser appellation, provided they are accorded their birth-right of serving their State.

I wish to conclude this note with a few authoritative declarations from eminent Britishers.

What Britishers  
Have Said.

Lord Chelmsford in his speech at the banquet given in his honour by the Nizam of Hyderabad, said:—

Build up within your own State a body of your subjects on whom you can rely to serve you. Take them and educate them, select the best and fit them for higher places and when fit, confer high places on them. Give them responsibility and power; enlist their interest and sympathy in the work of administration. I confidently predict that you will not regret the step you have taken."

It has been said of Lord Curzon that:—

“There was no spectacle which found less favour in his eyes than that of a culster of Europeans settling down upon a native State and sucking from it the moisture which ought to give sustenance to its own people.”

Wrote the famous Lord Macaulay:—

“Of all forms of tyranny, the worst is that of a nation over a nation; heaviest of all yokes, is the yoke of the stranger.”

## CHAPTER IV.

### Responsible Government.

Creed of the  
Nizam's subjects'  
League.

Clause IV.

"This league declares that all Hyderabadees are equal in the eyes of law, that all Hyderabadees should enjoy the full rights of citizenship—security of person and property, freedom of thought, of speech, of press, and freedom to perform one's religious obligations and that the executive should be made responsible to a legislature, fully representative of the various interests in the State in such a way that no class or community is in a position to dominate over the rest. This league believes in the supremacy of a judiciary independent of the executive.

I do not think any sensible person would seriously question the indispensability of this clause in the creed of the League. Every Hyderabadi, irrespective of class or creed, wants that the Law of the Land should make no distinction between

man and man ; every Hyderabadí desires and needs security of person and property, freedom of thought and of speech and freedom to perform his religious obligations without let or hindrance. So also every Hyderabadí wants that the Press of his country should be free to serve the State without being subjected to unnecessary harassment by State officials.

It must be clearly borne in mind that every kind of freedom that is sought and desired in the above clause is, of course, subject to the Laws of the Land. Freedom does not give any individual the license to break Laws. To make my meaning clear, I shall speak at length of the freedom of the press.

Freedom of the press. Newspapers, like any citizen, should also be subject to a law, which should give to every newspaper the freedom to act with the fullest liberty in the discharge of its duties. If a newspaper honestly believes that the educational or the financial policy of the State is not what it should be, it must certainly have the right to say so, because the mere act of a man pointing out to another what the former honestly believes to be the latter's mistake is not a crime either in law or in morals. In Hyderabad

today, a Newspaper dare not speak out even if it knows with certainty that a particular official or department is conducting himself or itself against the best interests of the State, and this because of an absurd "Gushti" which stipulates that no Newspaper can criticise any official or department. In other words, our Newspapers are free to praise our officials and their departments. They must, however, shut their eyes when they see anything dark or ugly. If this is all the function that the Government expects of the press, then why on earth subsidise so many papers, both local and foreign? Why again maintain the cumbrous machinery of the Information Bureau at such a huge expense? One Newspaper ought to satisfy the craze of the officials to hear their praises sung.

But we know it for a fact that our Sovereign does not approve of the above procedure. He wants to know the defects in the administration of his Government with a view to reform them, and he also knows that no human machinery, however honest and well-intentioned, can be infallible. Mistakes or errors of judgement are inseparable from every kind of Government, however civilised or democratic. A good Government is one which welcomes

What constitutes  
Good Government.

criticisms, weighs them on their merits and accepts them or rejects them, according as they are good or bad. Unwillingness or disinclination to hear and profit by other people's criticism is not a good trait of character. It only shows that officials who are so disposed have a very exaggerated notion of their own worth and capacity. Such a man, who is not willing to learn, is a danger to society and to the institution which he pretends to serve. Every official must have the moral courage to receive hard knocks of public criticism and to give knocks when ever necessary and desirable. An official who is shy of criticism must have something radically wrong about him, otherwise why should he be afraid to face the search-light of a free Press?

If a Newspaper oversteps the limits that Law has prescribed for it, by all means prosecute it and bring the offender to Book. Only let not every official take the Law into his own hands and persecute the poor journal. Law must operate equally for all. Just as I, a humble citizen, have no right to take the law into my own hands when a neighbour offends me, so also no official should have the right to deal with a Newspaper just as he likes, simply because the editor has had a fling at him.

Freedom begets responsibility : tell the  
 Newspapers that they are free to  
 write and publish what they please,  
 so long as they do not contravene  
 the laws of the Land, and you will suddenly find  
 that they will all begin to feel a sense of responsibility.

From the State's point of view, there is another very grave disadvantage in the fetters they have put on the press. Even if nothing is wrong with the administration, the mere fact of the existence of the ban on the freedom of the press must leave the public under the impression that something must be wrong somewhere ; otherwise newspapers would not have been kept under such strict surveillance.

A free Press is an indispensable feature of every civilised country and nation. We pretend to be sufficiently advanced too. How then can we do without a free press ?

The portion of this clause relating to the  
 Executive being made responsible  
 to a Legislature fully representative  
 of the various interests of the  
 State in such a way that no class or community, as  
 such, is given a position that will enable it to

Freedom Begets  
 Responsibility,

Beneficial and  
 Inevitable,

dominate over the rest, is very significant and important. This is a desire which, from the people's point of view, is legitimate and necessary and from the State's point of view is beneficial and inevitable. The Historic Firman on this subject dated 6th Farwardi 1329 Fasli., speaks of nothing less. We all know that responsible Government is coming. Nothing can obstruct its course and nobody can withhold it. Our Sovereign, more than anybody else in the State, knows the value of a full-fledged Legislature invested with effective powers to mould the administrative policies of the State.

When we know that a thing is coming, is it  
 Educating Public  
 Opinion.                      unwise or wrong to be prepared  
    for it? Responsible Government  
    will be a new thing for Hyderabad  
 when it comes. Human nature being what it is,  
 it naturally views every change with fear and distrust. It is natural for certain sections of people in Hyderabad to fight shy of the impending change. It is the duty of all honest and sincere public workers to allay feelings of fear and distrust. The Jagirdars, the Muslims, the Samasthans, the Christians and the Parsis and other minor interests must all be told and convinced that the change, far

from harming their interests, will really benefit them. That is just what the League proposes to do.

By including this clause in its creed and carrying on educative propaganda about it, the League will set every section of public opinion in Hyderabad thinking as to its position in the contemplated change. Today there are large sections of opinion in the country which refuse to believe that a change in the present constitution is at all imminent. They have, therefore, given no thought whatsoever to the question as to their own position in the new scheme of things. This clause will help them to take stock of their own position and will compel them to fix up the part that they are going to play in the future Government of the country.

The League has very wisely left the question of the electorate, franchise and allotment of seats open for mutual understanding and settlement by the different interests concerned. All that it says is that the **Legislature should be fully representative of the various interests in the State in such a way that no class or community as such, is in a position to dominate over the rest.** Every sensible Hyderabadi will agree that this is quite a fair proposition.

I will go still further and say that this is the only formula that can prevent communal or class jealousies from coming into play.

In this connection, I beg leave to express my own humble views on this question. Communal electorates for Hyderabad would sow seeds of dissensions. I would, therefore, recommend electorates on an economic basis. For instance, in an assembly of 100 members I would have at least 65 elected members, leaving the balance of 35 seats to be filled up by officials and nominated members. The 65 elected seats I would distribute between urban and rural areas. Looking to the special circumstances of the State I would give, say, 29 seats to the urban area and 36 to rural. To begin with, I would not go in for direct elections but make a start with indirect elections. These are just a few crude ideas which constitutional experts can work out in detail. All I wish to convey is that our future constitution should not set the ball of class or communal wrangles rolling.

As regards the supremacy of a Judiciary independent of the Executive, nothing much need be said. Hyderabad, it is gratifying to note, has

Economic  
Electorates  
Advisable.

given a lead to British India in this respect and we are well on our way to having a Judiciary *really* independent of the Executive.

In conclusion, I wish to express my firm conviction that administrative reform will be very difficult indeed unless the Executive is made responsible to the Legislature. In fact, intervention from abroad cannot cease unless this is done. Today, as things stand, our Executive is responsible neither to the Ruler nor to the people. If ever it is responsible at all, it is to a third party outside the dominions. This outrageous anomaly must end. The Executive must first become responsible to the Sovereign who, we are sure, would of his own Royal Will delegate his responsibility to the Legislature. The Executive must take orders and inspiration from our Sovereign, and not from any third party howsoever "Paramount." That is what the League stands for.

League Must  
Regain Nizam's  
Powers First.



## CHAPTER V.

### Deccani Nationalism.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' league.

Clause V.

"This league believes that the canker of communalism that is eating into the vitals of the Indian body politic, should not be allowed to take root in our State, and lays down as an article of its faith that progress of the State is only possible on the lines of a united Deccani Nationalism without distinction of caste, creed or sex—all striving for the best interests of the sovereign and the State."

This clause has merely to be stated to command universal acceptance. Students of history are well aware of the fact that Hyderabad, under the Asaf Jahi rule, has been singularly free from religious bigotry. You can ask any Hindu leader, even of the present day, and he will corroborate the above statement. There is any amount of evidence in support of this contention. But I shall reproduce here just two quotations.

Free from religious  
Bigotry.

Mr. T. H. Thornton C.S.I., who was for some time Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, in his life of Sir Richard Meade (former Resident of Hyderabad) writes :—

“ Having had for generations to govern and conciliate a large and not unwarlike Hindu population, the Ruling classes of Hyderabad are singularly free from religious bigotry.”

Mr. Henry George Briggs in his book entitled “The Nizam ” (page 119, Vol. I) writes :—

“ The Government, though Mohamedan, has  
Hindus in  
administration, no jealousy of employing Hindus  
among its officers. Raja Pratab-  
want was Prime Minister before Rukhu-ud-  
Dowlah and there are other exceptions. The  
principal man of business under the Mohammedan  
Ministry has always been a Hindu ; the whole of  
the finance is in the hands of the Hindus and of  
the farmers and managers of the revenue, as  
many are Hindus as Mohammedans.”

Recent testimonies to the above effect are not wanting. Persons of the eminence of Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and Dr. Rabindranath Tagore have given public expression to their firm conviction that Hyderabad is and has always been free from communal bias.

Among the Hindu Prime Ministers of Hyderabad, besides Raja Pratabwant, may be mentioned the name of Raja Raghonath Das, Raja Chandulal, Raja Narendar Pershad and His Excellency the Maharaja Sir Kishen Pershad Bahadur. Among the Jagirdars of the State, the list of Hindu beneficiaries is very formidable indeed. It runs into several hundreds.

If you look at the case of the Parsee community in Hyderabad, you will see that although they form such a negligible minority, they have filled several important posts in the State as the heads of Departments, while one of them, Sir Faridoon-ul-Mulk, rose to be Prime Minister.

Instances of this nature could be easily multiplied but that is not the purpose of this note.

The real point to be noted is that when the various communities living in Hyderabad have been able to carry on amicably for the past two centuries and more, there is no earthly reason why they should not continue to do so in the future.

The question to be discussed now is whether communalism has found its way into the State, and

if so, why ; secondly how can the evil be eradicated ?

It is a deplorable fact that communalism in British India has had its repercussions in the State as well. The causes for such a reaction are purely sentimental and psychological. In other words, what little distrust there is in the State between the communities is purely artificial or reflected. It is not genuine, because the causes for it do not exist.

But busybodies are not wanting who wish to fan the sleeping embers. Muslims from Northern India, who come to Hyderabad to earn a living, tell the local Muslims that Hyderabad is a Muslim State or that Muslims are a ruling class here and that the administrative machinery should remain strictly in the hands of the Muslims alone. Local Muslims are a simple and credulous lot. They believe all that they are told, and here starts the separatist tendency.

So also Hindus coming from the Maharashtra, the Madras Presidency or Northern India incite local Hindus to oust Muslims from their present position and advise them to capture the administrative machinery. Between these two out-

side elements, the atmosphere of the State is being darkened by clouds of suspicion and distrust.

Now let us consider what should be the duty of a nationalist Mulki under the circumstances. A nationalist Mulki should not bother whether the administrative posts are held by Muslims or Hindus ; all he should bother about is whether the incumbents are Hyderabadis or Non-Hyderabadis. Similarly, all administrative and legislative measures should be judged by whether they benefit Hyderabad or not, and the question as to whether the Hindus benefit more by it or the Muslims, should be left entirely out of consideration. In other words, the distinction hereafter should be as between Mulkis and foreigners and not between Hindus and Muslims.

A man can either be a nationalist or a communalist ; he cannot be both at one and the same time. I shall here define a nationalist Hyderabadí so that those who do not fall under the categories mentioned below may easily be recognised as communalists.

Know thyself  
and know thy  
neighbours:

A nationalist Hyderabadí is  
one who :—

1. Believes in preserving the State as a political entity in the commonwealth of India.

A true Hyderabadí can never think in terms of Andhras, Maharashtras, Karnatakis or Muslims. Such distinctions betray fissiparous tendencies which weaken the political integrity of the State.

2. Wishes to acquire for Hyderabad the independence from foreign control that is guaranteed to it under the treaties.

He who considers the Government of British India or the Residency as a sort of refuge or a court of appeal against the Government of Hyderabad is not a true Hyderabadí. Such a one will never stand up for the constitutional and political rights of the State. If he is asked to support the State in matters where "The Paramount Power" does not see eye to eye with the Nizam, he will manufacture excuses to back out.

3. Who would refuse to malign the ruler and his administration under any circumstances.

Instances are not wanting when certain individuals, institutions and newspapers have gone out of their way to paint the Nizam and his Government in the blackest possible colour. It is obvious that this was done only to lower the Nizams' Government in the eyes of the British Indian Government and public so that pretexts might be made available for outside intervention. No Government can claim to be faultless. It is only human to err. A

nationalist should try in a friendly and sympathetic manner to apply a corrective. If he goes about scandalising and maligning, he is not a true Hyderabadí.

4. Does not oppose the introduction of reforms or the liberalising of the present constitution.

There are people who oppose the establishment of a responsible form of Government or the introduction of free and compulsory primary education and such other benevolent measures simply because such measures do not suit their supposed interests. Such people cannot be called nationalists.

5. Does not seek foreign alliances in order to overcome any resistance (supposed or real) locally.

Tendencies are not lacking in certain groups to seek or invite foreign aid to solve local difficulties. Such tendencies are a serious blot on nationalism.

I shall now proceed to ask every single individual in Hyderabad to search his heart and decide once for all whether the above conditions are fulfilled in him. Even if one of the above conditions is lacking, then he is not a nationalist in the true sense. The above is the right criterion for distinguishing between a nationalist and a communalist. An easier method of distinguishing a communalist from a nationalist in Hyderabad is to ascertain

The Touchstone.

whether the person you wish to judge subscribes to the Creed of the Nizam's Subjects' League or not. If he does he is a good nationalist, otherwise he is a dangerous communalist. I say this because the creed of the League is thoroughly nationalistic and entirely free from communalism.

Clause 5 of the creed of the Nizam's Subjects' League speaks of Deccani Nationalism. Some people have tried to cut jokes at this idea. They do not seem to be able to imagine that people living in the Dominions and owing allegiance to the Nizam can form a homogeneous group. Such detractors have misread the recent tendencies in the country and have failed to assess the value, at its proper worth, of the surging tide of nationalism that is sweeping through the length and breadth of India.

What is the principal basis of the unification movement that I have just referred to ? It is simply this; that class, communal, sectarian, linguistic and provincial differences should cease to distinguish one Indian from another.

But since India is a huge continent and must necessarily consist of convenient units for adminis-

trative purposes; that is why do we hear of autonomous provinces, so that the task of governance may be decentralised and simplified.

The question confronting Indian nationalism is whether the formation of provinces should be on linguistic basis, as is suggested by one school of thought, or the division should take into full account age-long traditions and historical truths and should be such as not to retard the growth of nationalism. If there were no such thing as Princely India, then the former course may have been within the range of practicalities. But with one third of the country, having the distinction of being coloured yellow on the map of India, it is next to impossible to think of parcelling out the sub-continent into linguistic units.

Historical and political reasons apart, such a procedure would retard the growth of nationalism; because the development of a common language would then remain a mere ideal: whereas, if provinces were formed on grounds weightier than merely linguistic, then the development of a common language and a common culture would

Problem for Indian  
Nationalists.

Linguistic Provinces  
Anti-national.

become easy of achievement. For reasons, therefore historical, cultural and nationalistic, the idea of linguistic provinces should be totally discarded.

What is true of India is true of Hyderabad. Hyderabad is not merely a political and historical unit but a cultural unit as well. From the nationalist point of view, therefore, it must remain as it is and not be meddled with. In its present form, it has great potentialities to promote common culture and common language and thus aid Nationalism.

Leave Hyderabad  
as it is:

### A word about public institutions!

Communal  
Institutions must go:

It is my firm belief that communal, and sectarian institutions whether social, political, or educational—must go if Hyderabad is to make any progress on thoroughly nationalist lines. Instead, there must be brought into existence bodies which must consist of all communities and classes and work for all. It is besides my point to mention such institutions by name or discuss their merits or demerits. Suffice it to say that because they breed a warring mentality such institutions must be abolished.

I shall conclude this note with a few quotations from the Convocation addresses to the Osmania University.

Nizam Jung's  
Stern Warning.

Warned the Nawab Nizam  
Jung Bahadur:—

“Last of all, a word of warning against communal dissension. Reluctant to waste words on the obvious, I will only say that none but ignorant, mischievous and foolish men fight over religious differences. Hyderabad has always been free from this vice and, will, I hope, remain free for ever.

Hyder Nawaz  
Jung's Sane View.

Said the Nawab Hyder Nawaz  
Jung Bahadur:—

“There must in order to strengthen this State be created a sentiment among the people of the State which will make them not merely the objects but the inspirers of administration. How can this be achieved? In the first place we must build up a feeling of common nationality. Flowing from our allegiance to the Nizam and from the history of these Dominions, we are part inheritors of the culture of the Moghul empire which owing to the efforts of successive Rulers of Hyderabad has been transformed into a national Deccani culture. It is neither Hindu nor Muslim. It is a synthesis of both, with some thing peculiar to the south added to it. Culture is not the handmaid of any religion. For example, we do not call the culture of Europe Christian, but western. Culture develops through environment, through history, and

through a thousand and one factors of which religion or different religions may be one but not the predominant factor.'

Mehdi Yar Jung's  
Stirring Appeal.

## Appealed the Nawab Mehdi Yar Jung Bahadur.

"As for duty towards the State, you must try and create a patriotism that knows no difference of race or community, so that you may become 'Hyderabadis' pure and simple. Make efforts where and when you can for the advancement of your State and, in all matters, guard jealously its honour".



## CHAPTER VI.

### Our Common Language.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' League.

Clause VI.

"This League believes that in order to promote the cause of Deccani nationalism and Indian Federalism, Hindustani (the Lingua Franca of India) should be encouraged and fostered as the common language of Hyderabad.

It is very unfortunate that people in British India have started wrangling over the question of language. To me, Hindi or Urdu are just the same. If there are more Persian and Arabic words, it is called Urdu, while if there is a preponderance of Sanskrit words, the same language is called Hindi. The promoters of the League have done a wise thing in eschewing both the controversial terms and have adopted the term "Hindustani," which means, the common language of India, shorn of unnecessary importations from Arabic, Sanskrit and Persian, the language that is understood by almost every man in the street.

Another strong point in favour of Hindustani is that it is really a national language. It is the product of the fusion of Hindu and Muslim cultures. Hindu writers and poets have contributed as much to its development as Muslim writers and poets have done. It is spoken by the largest number of persons in India and is understood by almost all.

The quarrel over script is, in my opinion, a mere matter of detail. If India, as a whole, comes to any definite settlement about it, it will then be time for Hyderabad to consider whether it is worth our while disturbing the *status quo*.

But it is important to remember in this connection that Hindustani can have the widest possible appeal only when it is least contaminated by unnecessary and unassimilable words of foreign extraction. The Abdul Kalam Azad type of Urdu should be discouraged as also the Moonje type of Hindi. The middle course is always the best course and that is what the Nizam's Subjects' League proposes.



## CHAPTER VII.

### Economic Regeneration.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' League.

Clause VII.

"This League declares that the economic regeneration of the State can only come through rapid industrialisation. It views with alarm the growing indebtedness of the peasantry and the lower middle classes."

It has been suggested that Clause No, 7, as it is drafted, does not do justice to the economic needs of the people of Hyderabad, that it is not sufficiently comprehensive, and that it merely throws out a broad hint towards the miserable condition of the people. Besides it is contended that economists differ amongst themselves as regards the panacea suggested in the clause.

It is not surprising that the growing indebtedness of the peasantry and the lower middle classes has caused wide-spread alarm. Even the middle classes and the so called propertied classes are steeped in debts. The following figures culled from Government publications may serve as a

Even Well-to-do  
Classes Are  
Bankrupt.

fairly reliable index of the indebtedness of the Jagirdar classes. It appears that the liabilities of the 42 Estates under the management of the Court of Wards in 1932 stood as high as nearly 54 lakhs. Does not that show that things are pretty rotten with the very class that, of all others, could reasonably be expected to be getting on fairly smoothly, so far as finances go? I have rarely met a Nawab a Jagirdar, a Mukhatadar or a Mansabdar who could boast that his jewellery was not mortgaged with the Marwari or that no suits were pending against him in the Civil Court.

The financial condition of the middle classes is even worse. They have no property to mortgage and no capital to invest in trade or industry. Perforce they have to fall back on Government service which is becoming scarce, day by day, as a result of the large influx of non-Mulkies in services, contracts and other available means of earning a livelihood. The latest Census report, speaking of immigration from such distant provinces such as U. P., the Punjab, and Rajputana says:—"Business and service in the public administrative departments are the principal attraction to the people of such distant provinces." According to the 1931 Census,

Middle classes  
worst off,

the number of such immigrants from the North is nearly 25,000, more than 8,000 of whom are money-lenders from Rajputana and Marwar; while the balance of 17,000 and odd has managed to smuggle itself into Government and Jagir services or has enrolled itself among the various lists of contractors.

In this connection it is much to be deplored that the percentage of Hyderabad Muslims—Decadent & Unprogressive. Muslims in lucrative occupations is very meagre. Out of every one thousand Muslim earners, only sixty have any income from rent of land, which shows that members of this Community are landless and the percentage of Zamindars and Agriculturists among them is very insignificant. The same is their plight in the liberal professions. Out of every thousand earners of this community, only 12 are either lawyers, doctors or teachers. In the table of occupations given in the latest Census Report, trade is not even mentioned as an occupation followed by Muslims, which shows how very infinitesimal is their percentage in it. A small percentage of Muslims in the rural area has given 'Cultivators' or 'Field labourers' as its occupation. But those who know the plight of landserfs in the State can wel

imagine the economic condition of this class of Muslims.

The extent of unemployment in the State can be gauged from the fact that 42 per cent of the male population in the State and 64 per cent of the female population are not earning anything by themselves but are depending on others for livelihood. Small wonder then that money-lending has become the most paying and attractive occupation in these Dominions. From the latest Census Report, it can be gathered that more than 22,000 are engaged in this blood-sucking business, 84% of the total money lenders in the State being Brahmanic Hindus, while the number of Komtis and Marwaris is 7,622.

If we probe into the conditions of the agricultural classes, we are authoritatively informed that "The families without land, either of their own or held as tenants, constitute about 30% of the total agricultural families".

Reviewing the report of the Economic Enquiry of the Hyderabad State by Prof. Keshav Iyengar, Mr. A. B. Collins, I. C. S., (formerly Secretary

to Nizam's Government in the department of Commerce and Industries,) writes :—

“The fact that over a quarter of the land has passed out of the hands of the original holders during the last 15 years, while a large number of remaining holders are heavily indebted, seems to show that something must be done to protect the Agricultural classes”.

Proceeding further, Mr. A. B. Collins observes.

“Everything points to the gradual dispossession of all smaller holders, unless the growth of education, the spread of the co-operative movement or some legislative measure such as a Land Alienation Act comes to the rescue of the cultivators”.

Dominant  
Deshmukhs.

Referring to the Telingana districts, Mr. Collins remarks,

“About a quarter of the wet land has passed out of the hands of the original owners. Most of this seems to have gone into the hands of Deshmukhs and other land-owners who dominate the economic life of this area.”

The extent of rural indebtedness may be realised from the following statement by Prof. Iyengar:—

Rural Indebtedness.

“In a village consisting of 35 families, 27 families were indebted to the extent of Rs. 4,680. The average debt per indebted family being Rs. 173 nearly. Only eight families out of 35 were debt free”.

The result of Mr. Collins' calculation is more startling. He says:—

“The incidence of debt per acre is about Rs. 289, the average debt per resident family including land mortgages being Rs. 150”.

The plight of the wage-earning families may be gathered from the following remarks of Prof. Keshav Iyengar:—

“Underfeeding by stifling appetite, is being resorted to by a large number of wage-earning families”.

As I have pointed out before, the money lenders in this State are actually sucking the blood of all the needy people in the State by extorting from them exorbitant rates of interest. In this connection Prof. Iyengar's remarks are noteworthy.

Blood-Sucking  
Money Lenders.

“The real rate of interest borne by the ryots is an impossible rate, and any scheme of rural reconstruction would have to give primary attention to the necessity of immediately reducing this rate”.

The percentage of debt to land is very heavy in the State. The following figures taken from the Government publications are sufficiently tell—tale:—

Nanded	54.9
Warangal	51.8
Raichur	57.7
Aurangabad	38.9

If the facts and figures given above do not comprehensively describe the extent of poverty and unemployment in the State, it will be well to remember that the number of beggars and vagrants in the State is nearly, 1,30,000. Financial stringency has driven nearly 10,000 women to adopt prostitution as a means of earning a livelihood.

I have heard it alleged seriously by people who knew what they were talking about, that the Patels, Patwaris, Deshmukhs, Deshpandes and other Watandars in the Dominions are to a very large extent responsible for the misery of the Agriculturists. This allegation does not seem to be baseless, in view of the fact that the Patels and Patwaris are the virtual rulers of Hyderabad. Their influence in their respective villages is simply incredible. Human nature being what it is and the Patels and Patwaris, coming as they do from classes with no very high sense of moral duty, it is very likely that these gentlemen use their influence

Beggars and  
Prostitutes.

Who is Looting  
the Ryots ?

more for their own ends than for the benefit of the people under their care.

How the Patels and Patwaris happened to acquire such vast influence over the life of Hyderabad's 21,697 villages is a complicated story, the main features whereof are the facts that :—

1. These offices are hereditary posts and therefore power and influence has gone on accumulating in one and the same family.

2. The Taluq officials, instead of exercising vigilant control over the work of the Patels and Patwaris, are themselves controlled and guided by them for obvious reasons, with the result that the Patels and Patwaris rule over their villages more despotically than ever, confident of the backing and support of their superiors.

The very first item in the programme of rural reconstruction should, therefore, be to divest the village officials of their extraordinary influence. I am assured that this can be done effectively by abolishing the prevailing system of making Patelship and Patwariship hereditary, permanent and non-transferable posts. Like all other officers, Patels and Patwaris should be paid servants of the

Hyderabad's  
21,697 Rulers.

Dethrone the Patels  
and Patwaris.

Government, not permanently attached to any village but liable to be transferred to any other village, say every three or five years. I confess that I am not competent to put forward this suggestion with any air of authority, but I do commend it for the serious consideration of those who are qualified to pronounce an opinion about it.

It may sound common-place but it is a truth that can bear repetition that half the troubles of the agriculturist classes would be solved if the Co-operative Department functions in a manner that would justify its existence. It is true that the Co-operative movement has not fulfilled the expectations of its protagonists but a better solution has yet to be found. This movement ought to have provided the best panacea for the poverty - stricken peasantry of Hyderabad. But unfortunately it has proved itself to be something quite different. I am not in a position to analyse the causes that have led to the failure of the Co-operative movement in Hyderabad. From what I hear, it appears that official red-tapism and widespread corruption in the subordinate staff of the department are two of the principal causes.

Red-tapism and  
corruption in  
Co-operative Dept.

A district official told me that when a peasant secures a loan of Rs. 100 from a society, the amount that he actually receives is not more than Rs. 50, the balance going into the pocket of those who helped him to secure the loan. As for the recovery of the sum of Rs. 100 supposed to be due from the peasant with interest, I am given to understand that no extensions or facilities in repayment are allowed to the loan-holder unless the officials concerned are bribed. If this picture is even partially true, then I have no hesitation in accusing the department of having added to the miseries of the unfortunate agriculturist. It is generally complained that loans are received by the applicants long after the need for them has expired. A Marwari, it is said, is more prompt in paying out money. Besides, Marwaris are handy and available in almost every village while co-operative societies are not so accessible. Judged therefore, from the points of view of easy accessibility and prompt payment, the ubiquitous Marwari has distinct advantages. If the Co-operative Societies wish to rescue the peasant from the clutches of the usurious money lenders, they must cultivate the two requisites of easy accessibility and promptitude in payments.

Why are Marwaris  
Preferred ?

Another point that the Department might consider is that help can be given to the needy in kind as well as in coin. For instance, every Society can maintain a store of all the requisites of its constituent members such as seeds, manure, cattle, agricultural implements etc. The Veterinary Department can be asked to co-operate in supplying the right type of cattle for agricultural purposes. This system has a distinct advantage over the present one of advancing monies, in that while cash is liable to be wasted by the borrower, if his needs are supplied in kind, there is greater chance of the help proving useful and productive.

In short, if the various departments coordinate with the co-operative department and work in a missionary spirit, I am sure the outlook will change and the country will be the happier for it.

There was a time when the State could boast of several cottage industries. Due to lack of support and encouragement by the Government, most of them are either dead or disappearing. Here is a list of industries that could have flourished and provided employment to lakhs of Mukies:—

Help in Kind—  
A Suggestion.

Industries Dead  
and Disappearing.

1. Paper Industry ... Aurangabad, Karimnagar and Medak.
2. Dyeing and Printing Industry. Aurangabad, Warangal, Medak, Karimnagar, Nalgonda and Raichur.
3. Gold Thread Industry. Patan, Aurangabad, Hyderabad and Armoor.
4. Spinning of cotton and wool by hand.
5. The Sela and Pagri Industry. Aurangabad, Nanded and Bir.
6. Durry Weaving Industry. Alumpur and Nanded.
7. Imru, Mushru and Kumkhab weaving industry. Aurangabad.
8. Woolen carpet industry. Warangal and Parkhal.
9. Tussar Industry ... Mahadeopoor, Chinnoor, Bijjoor, Armoor and Parkhal.
10. Arms and weapons. Hyderabad, Bhir and Hanumkonda.

- |                          |     |   |
|--------------------------|-----|---|
| 11. Metal industry       | ... | Nirmal, Chundoor, Tungampett, Bhimgal and Peddapalli. |
| 12. Toy making industry. |     | Kushtagi and Nirmal.                                  |
| 13. Filligree work       | ... | Karimnagar, Manakunda and Jaktial.                    |
| 14. Bidar work           | ... | Bidar.  |
| 15. Glass Bangles        | ... | Manikunda and Koelkunda.                              |

In this connection the figures of imports that could be manufactured or otherwise provided locally are quoted from the Customs Report just to indicate the chances of industrialisation in Hyderabad and the consequent stoppage of the flow of money outside the dominions.

Our State has some of the best cotton producing areas in India. The potentialities of the textile industry here are, therefore, very great; potentialities which at present, are being simply ignored, as is evident from the figures of imports in cotton, yarn and products.

	Rs.
1. Cotton twist and Yarn	.... 78,00,000
2. Cotton piece-goods and other manufactures.	... 1,76,00,000
3. Handloom piece-goods	.... 38,00,000

		Rs.
4.	Cotton durries	.... 3,00,000
5.	Silk, Raw and Yarn	... 11,00,000
6.	Silk, Tusser and silk piecegoods...	18,26,000
7.	Artificial silk-piece-goods	... 24,00,000
8.	Woolen carpets and rugs	.... 7,00,000
9.	Gold and Silver thread and lace...	7,32,000
10.	Boots and shoes.	.... 8,00,000
11.	Fruits	... 7,00,000
12.	Common Salt	... 65,00,000
13.	Sugar	... 55,00,000
14.	Gudh	... 44,00,000
15.	Cigarettes, Cigars and other manufactures of tobacco	... 12,00,000
16.	Leather manufactures excluding boots and shoes	... 2,00,000
17.	Manufactures of brass	... 9,00,000
18.	„ „ copper	... 2,00,000
19.	Silver manufactures and ornaments	... 3,00,000
20.	Bangles	... 7,00,000
21.	Paper, card-board etc.	... 8,00,000
22.	Soaps	... 3,50,000
23.	Metals	... 9,00,000
24.	Cocoanut and other vegetable oils	... 12,30,000
25.	Glass and Glass-wares	... 4,28,000

I have picked out 25 items out of a formidable list of 125 items of imports. I believe that a good many of the commodities mentioned in the above list can be manufactured or otherwise made available locally and thus we can prevent nearly 6½ crores of rupees from going out of the State, incidentally adding to the economic wealth of the State and providing employment to lakhs and lakhs of Mulkis.

Is it not possible to avoid importing any of the commodities mentioned above? If our Government were industrially minded and industrially disposed, they could surely exploit local labour and local capital, and if necessary with the initial help of experts, make a start in the case of at least some of the industries named.

It might be argued that no local industry can survive the initial transitional stages without tariff protection and that the commercial treaty between the Governments of Hyderabad and British India comes in the way of our Government extending the necessary help to our budding industries. That is so; but, in continuation of the negotiations now proceeding between the two

If Government  
has the Will?

Treaty Must be  
Given full Effect to.

Governments, in view of the impending federation, it should be possible for our Government to have the old paralysing arrangement revised and duly modified in a manner conducive to the growth of Industries in Hyderabad.

What Should be the Attitude of the Commerce and Industries Department? “Live and let live” should be the guiding principle of the two parties in this as well as in other negotiations. Hyderabad can advance industrially without vitally harming Non-Hyderabad interests, and even if apprehensions to the contrary are not baseless, Hyderabad cannot help it. She cannot and must not remain economically backward just to oblige her allies. No honest Government ought to sacrifice the industrial and economic interests of Hyderabad at the altar of the self-aggrandising and grabbing tendencies of others, no matter who the others are.

The Mulki movement does not merely mean that service alone should be reserved for Mulkies, but it also means that Mulki industries should thrive and nothing that we can manufacture or provide locally should be imported from outside the Dominions. There is a wide scope of work for Mulki economists and capitalists, provided the

Department of Commerce and Industries takes a sympathetic and helpful attitude towards the national cause.

The poverty of the agricultural classes is a sad commentary on the work of the Agricultural Department. This Department which has been in existence for the last 22 years has failed to justify itself. It will be seen from the above that much can be done towards the economic regeneration of the State that was once admittedly rich but has been impoverished owing to the huge burden of military expenditure that was imposed on it against the will of the successive Nizams, by the self-styled "Paramount Power", in its own interests. If Hyderabad had not been fleeced for Imperial purposes as it always has been, then the general condition of the country would not have stood at such a low ebb.

Who is Responsible  
for our Economic  
Ruination.

Imposition of a huge military burden, intervention in the day-to-day administration of the State and supporting Ministers against their Rulers—such were the tactics employed by those who claim to be our friends, to dislocate the economic structure of this affluent land. We are wiser,

though sadder, by our past bitter experiences. But it is never too late to mend our ways as well as our attitude.

Other factors that are militating against the industrial and commercial interests of Hyderabad and hampering its economic progress are:—

What is Hampering  
our Growth.

1. The fact that the free use of the port of Masulipatam and the liberty to establish factories there is denied to the Government of Hyderabad, although these rights are guaranteed to us by the very first article of the treaty of 1802.

Get Back

A Sea-port is admittedly one of the essential pre-requisites to the industrial development of any State. Article 2 of the said treaty reads as follows:—

“ His Highness’s ships bearing his flag shall be entitled at all times to the protection of His Britannic Majesty’s and of the Hon. Company’s ships of war, and shall be admitted into all ports belonging to the British Government in India upon the footing of the most favoured nations ”

2. The fact that, in contravention of the Article 3 of 1802, the Government of British India impose Customs duties on articles imported from

Revise Fiscal  
Arrangement.

any part of the British Empire into the Nizam's Dominions, and on articles from the Dominions when exported outside British India.

By disregarding the provisions of the treaty of 1802, the Government of British India are placing a heavy and unjust burden on the people of Hyderabad—a burden, which apart from treaty rights goes counter to the accepted principles of taxation and the principles embodied in the Barcelona Convention of 1921. No Government has a right to levy duties on goods consumed by subjects of another Government. When goods from abroad are imported duty free into the States of Kashmir and Nepal, there is no reason why a similar privilege should not be enjoyed by the people of Hyderabad.

3. The fact that Hyderabad has to put up with the tariff policy and regulations of British India, although our Government are not consulted in framing them.

The Tyranny of  
Tariffs.

Hyderabad, in view of its political and economic importance, must be represented in the Tariff Board set up in pursuance of the recommendations of the Indian Fiscal commission. In this connection it is worth while remembering that even the Butler Committee has agreed that "The States unquestionably have a claim to consultation in matters of general policy as to maritime customs."

4. The fact that Hyderabad cannot expand her railway system because of the obstacles put in her way by the Government of British India in the shape of claims to exercise jurisdiction over railway lands and other restrictions equally unjustified and high handed.

Obstructing Railway  
Expansion.

The question of jurisdiction over railway lands raises issues affecting the sovereignty of the Nizam, besides creating difficulties for the Hyderabad Government of Administrative and technical nature. In this connection I venture to suggest that the Hyderabad Government should make yet another effort to acquire the railway line from Sholapur to Guntakal (a distance of about 130 miles) which lies within the Nizam's Dominions and work it as a part of the Nizam's State Railway system. The Hyderabad Government has a preferential right of profiting by the railway that traverses the Nizam's Dominions. Moreover, if this is done it will pave the way for a satisfactory and amicable solution of the question of jurisdiction over railways in the Nizam's territories.

It will be recalled that in the famous case of Mohummed Yousufuddin versus the Queen Empress which was decided by the Privy Council in 1897, the Late Lord Halsbury observed; "The Railway territory has never become part of British India, and is still part of the Dominions of the Nizam."

Mr. A. P. Nicholson in his 'Scraps of Paper' notices that railway lands in Indian States have been used by the

Government of British India "for purposes detrimental to the interests of the State". He adds: "It was never intended that these lands should become British Territory, that large railway colonies should spring up there with co-operative stores which excludes the local trader, and that exciseable articles should be sold without payment of local duties. It was not part of any bargain that State Police should have no right to arrest offenders escaping on to the railway from native territory; or that the elaborate procedure of extradition should be necessary. It was never intended, nor was it asked for, or granted, that British Indian Legislation, including the British Fiscal Laws should be applied to these lands to the exclusion of State Legislation. Indeed the State stipulated that there should be no such infringement of their rights and the Government agreed to the stipulation in various cases".

5. The fact that Hyderabad cannot afford to perfect and expand her postal system partly owing to the enormous losses that the Department suffers as a result of the high-handedness of the Government of British India in opening post-offices and planting letter boxes anywhere in the Dominions and partly owing to the unnecessary expense that it is put to in delivering free of charge, throughout the Dominions, all articles transferred from British Post Offices.

A Clog in Postal  
Wheel.

It appears that there are nearly 50 British post offices in our Dominions and that the number of articles received

from British Post Offices and delivered free of charge by our Postal Department every year is in the vicinity of 85 to 90 lakhs. The unfair competition by the 50 British Post Offices and the arrangements to deliver such enormous number of goods free of charge involve a net loss of Rs. 2 to 3 lakhs every year for the Hyderabad Postal Department.

6. The fact that Hyderabad is not allowed to construct and maintain independent lines of telegraph for internal purposes—a measure that would give great impetus to trade, besides facilitating quick despatch of administrative work.

Ban on Telegraphic  
Facilities.

7. The fact that the Government of British India levy excise duties on salt and petrol imported into the Nizam's Dominions, thereby placing on the people of Hyderabad an unjust and heavy burden of nearly 25 lakhs every year.

An Unjust Burden  
of Rs. 25 Lakhs  
Annually.

8. The fact that in the case of bills relating to external trade the Government of British India do not recognise the Hyderabad State Stamps, which puts our merchants to unnecessary and unjustified expenditure.

Recognise our  
Stamps.

An arrangement exists between the Governments of Mysore and British India, under which each Government

recognises the stamp of the other. If the same reciprocity is extended to Hyderabad, it will lighten to a great extent the present burden on our merchants and enhance the volume of trade between Hyderabad and British India.

No Control Over  
Waters.

9. The fact that Hyderabad is not allowed to take full advantage of the waters of her rivers for irrigation and hydro-electric purposes.

The Currency  
Muddle.

10. The fact that while the British India rupee is allowed to be used in Hyderabad, the same privilege is not conceded to the Asaf Jahi coin in British India. Moreover, the existence of British Indian Banks in Hyderabad (particularly the Imperial Bank of India), the fact that the currency and the exchange policy of the Government of British India and Great Britain adversely affect Hyderabad interests and the fact of the exchange fluctuations between the British Indian and Hyderabad currencies—all these factors militate against the economic interests of the people of Hyderabad.

Cantonment a  
Menace.

11. The fact that the Cantonments in the Nizam's Dominions have been and are being used as commercial marts to the detriment of the in-

terests, both of the State and its other subjects outside Cantonments.

I am not aware if our Government have lodged any protest against this encroachment on their legitimate interests, but the Gwalior State did take up the matter with the Government of India during the Viceroyalty of Lord Hardinge. In a letter to the Resident at Gwalior, the Maharaja's Political Secretary wrote thus:—"The Durbar thinks that looking to the History, nature and scope of these military stations, the Government of India will agree with them in the view that these cantonments were never intended to be converted into and used as commercial marts to the prejudice of the interests both of the Darbar and their other subjects outside the Cantonment".

In response to this representation the Government of India called a Conference in 1909 to settle the question. The recommendations of the said conference were to the effect that "The British Cantonments situated in the midst of the State territories cannot be allowed to become trade-marts or centres, that the States were entitled to tax the civil population of the Cantonments and that the Military population only should enjoy the benefit of duty free supplies.

12. The fact that the Excise revenue of Secunderabad is not transferred to the Hyderabad Treasury as it should in all fairness be done—a factor that deprives the State budget of more than Rs. 20,00,000.

Peshkar's perennial  
Peshkash to  
Paramountcy.

Among the many wrongs that Raja Chandoolal has done to the Hyderabad State, the above is one. As the Cantonment authorities have no right to appropriate the said revenue for their own use, it is high time they credit the amount to the proper budget with retrospective effect.

I have dealt very briefly with some of the outstanding questions that confront  
 Hyderabad—A Prey to Injustices. us, as we plan the economic regeneration of Hyderabad.

It was not possible and advisable for me to deal exhaustively with these and similar problems, but I hope the reader will now have some idea as to how our economic growth is being hampered and in whose interests. I trust that someone, possessing greater leisure than I do, will go deeper into these problems and reveal more fully the extent of injustice to which we, the people of Hyderabad, have long been an easy prey.

Mr. Hoover, ex-president of the United States of America, has remarked:—"It  
 Hoover's Dictum. is obviously the function of the Government to recruit and distribute economic information, to investigate economic and scientific problems, to point out the remedy for economic failure or the road to progress and to inspire and

assist in Co-operative action so that the economic interests of the nation may be promoted”.

If the Government of Hyderabad abandons its present attitude of unconcern and embarks on an aggressive and progressive industrial policy, it can do much to rehabilitate the country's economic life. The people should be advised what commodities they can manufacture with profit from the raw material now being exported from the country, in order to provide work for Mulki labour.

A change in the educational system may be necessitated to suit the requirements of an aggressively industrial outlook on the part of the Government. In this connection it will be interesting to note that a radical change has been introduced in the Chinese Educational System lately. The Nanking Government has decreed from the beginning of 1933 : “All Government Universities and Colleges should cease temporarily to accept new students for law, literature, and art courses. Emphasis should instead be placed upon instructions in agriculture, engineering, medicine, aeronautics, and allied subjects with a view to providing the country with the technical experts required for its industrial developments.”

As Sir M. Visvesarayya observed in the course of an address delivered before the University Union, Bangalore, some two years ago, "Agriculture is a necessary industry in every country but no nation in modern times has grown rich from agricultural pursuits alone. In India the pressure of the population on land has been growing steadily and under the primitive methods of cultivation still practised, the economic law of diminishing returns has begun to operate.

"The Montford report characterises agriculture in India as a precarious occupation. There is no profit to be made from it and the indebtedness of the peasantry is growing. A comparison of the Census figures between 1911 and 1931 shows that, while Western Nations and Japan have been concentrating on industries and trade, India has been growing more and more predominantly agricultural."

If Hyderabad is to profit by the experience of other countries, she must decide once for all to stimulate industrial development.

There was a time, not far distant, when the economic condition of the people of Hyderabad was better off than

Our Prosperous  
Past.

that of their neighbours in British India. A few quotations given below will be found sufficiently convincing.

Mr. Blunt, who visited Hyderabad just before the installation of His Late Highness the Nawab Mir Mahboob Ali Khan of happy memories in his book entitled *India under Ripon* writes, "It is worth remembering that the only villages I found free from debt in India were in the Nizam's territory."

In a letter to Lord Elphinstone dated 26th October 1838, General Fraser then Resident of Hyderabad wrote thus :—"I am inclined to suspect there has been some exaggeration in the accounts we have heard of the maladministration of this country. I found it, on crossing the Krishna, more fertile and better cultivated than many of the Company's districts I had passed through."

Colonel Stewert also a Resident of Hyderabad wrote thus :—"During the scarcity which prevailed last year in the city and in the Company's neighbouring districts, it was a subject of remark by every traveller coming here from Madras or Masulipatam that the moment they entered the

A Resident's  
Testimony.

Nizam's Dominions all the worst appearance of famine in a great measure ceased. They no longer saw the villages filled with the dead and the dying."

It will be clear from the quotations given above that the economic condition of the people of the State was more prosperous than that of the Company's subjects. But the excessive military burden imposed on the Hyderabad Exchequer by the East India Company and its successor, coupled with the policy of our British Allies in subordinating the commercial and the industrial interests of Hyderabad to those of British India, has impoverished Hyderabad to such an extent that this State can now hardly be compared with other parts of India.

How this slow but steady impoverishment of our State was brought about is a long and distressing tale. To appraise its full significance, one has to wade through a mass of literature dealing with the subjects of the Subsidiary Forces, the Russel Brigade, the Berar lease, the dealings of William Palmer and Company, the infringement of the commercial treaty, the two railway and mining

Once Rich :  
Now Poor.

Tale of Distress.

deals, the fishy offer of sixty lakhs for Imperial defence and similar impositions elicited either by coercion or by persuasion.

In a brief note such as this it is not possible to unearth all the mysteries connected with the above named episodes. One fact, however, emerges most conspicuously out of this dispassionate study, and that is that Hyderabad has been persistently victimised and exploited for the benefit of others. There is a great moral in this story.

Profit by past  
experience.



## CHAPTER VIII.

### Our Relations with the Government of British India.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' League.

Clause VIII.

This league believes that the treaties of the Hyderabad State are with His Majesty's Government in British India and not with the British Crown and that any change in the constitution or personnel of the Government of British India need cause no misgivings to the Hyderabad State so far as its treaty rights and privileges are concerned. The relationship being purely contractual, the mutual rights and obligations flowing from those treaties and the exact nature of the relationship so established can only be ascertained by reference to legal principles.

What is Behind  
the Theory?

It is both significant and suspicious that the question "With whom were the treaties made—the Government of British India or the Crown?" has been raised on the eve of the extension of res-

possible Government in India. It is also difficult to understand why distinction is sought to be made in the application of the term "Crown," when it is used in relation to the States as against British India.

An explanation is afforded by various declarations of responsible Britishers who fear that the conferment of Dominion status on India would involve the withdrawal of the British Army and thus Britain's financial interests would be jeopardised. To avoid the catastrophe, they (in the words of Mr. A. P. Nicholson) argue that "Britain's pledge to Indian India cannot be fulfilled unless there is an army in India under Britain's control, an army to implement our covenants."

Sir Leslie Scott, in the *Law Quarterly Review* of June 1928 wrote thus :—"The British Government has undertaken defence of all the States and therefore to remain in India with whatever Military and Naval forces may be requisite to enable it to discharge that obligation. It cannot hand over those forces to any other Government : to a foreign power such as France and Japan ; to a Dominion Government, such as Canada and Australia ; nor even to British India."

It is, therefore, clear that this theory of direct relationship with the Crown has been engineered by scheming bureaucrats with the sole object of depriving India of the control of her own army and consequently finance. It is a great pity that the princes of India have failed to see through this game and played into the hands of British reactionaries.

What the correct historical and constitutional position is, I shall leave it to professor Grumukh Nihal Singh (Head of the Department of Political Science in the Benares University) to narrate in his own words :—

The Correct  
Position.

(1) "The original treaties and engagements etc., in most cases, were made between the States and the East India Company and the relations were conducted by the officials of the Company in India, from 1773 by the Governor-General under the authority of the Court of Directors and the general control of the Board of Control. Often the Governor-General conducted the dealings with the States against the advice and without previous consultation with the Board of Directors and the Board of Control. The East India Company first got its powers through Royal Charters ; but later

it derived its authority by acts of Parliament. The Government was carried on in the name of the East India Company by its officials and all treaties and engagements were made by the officials of the Company in the name of the company and not of the British Crown though under authority derived from the British Parliament. **It is, therefore, untrue to say, that the treaties, engagements etc., of the States were made with the British Crown.** If any proof is necessary it is furnished by the very extracts which are given by Sir Leslie Scott in the Appendix to the "Joint opinion." This is the first sentence of the Appendix (Page 75 of the Report) and is taken from Queen Victoria's Proclamation, 1858 :—

" We hereby announce to the Native  
 " Princes of India that all treaties  
 " and engagements made with them  
 " by or under authority of the Honou-  
 " rable East India Company are by us  
 " accepted and will be scrupulously  
 " observed....."

(2) " The treaties and engagements were entered into by the States with the East India Company because it was the Ruler of an important portion of India and

A Mere Corollary.

not because it was a British Trading Company. And it was because the Government of the territories of the East India Company was transferred to the Crown (acting through the Secretary of State for India and the Governor-General in Council with the help of other officials and responsible to the British Parliament) that the Crown also accepted the duty—among others to recognise the treaties and engagements with the Indian States. It was, so to speak, a corollary to the acceptance of the Government of British India ; and if the Government of British India had been transferred to some other body or person, that body or person would have had to assume the consequent responsibility of accepting the treaties and engagements with the Indian Princes.

(3) “ The people of India and the Indian Princes accepted the transfer gladly, because they recognised that the change was for the better, and was unavoidable, under the circumstances. There was no question of the consent of the Princes ; the might of the British and the jealousies of the states were enough to make them acquiesce in the change ; the only consolation was that the change was advantageous on the whole, for both the people of British India and the Indian Princes.

(4) “ Since the transfer of the Government of British India to the Crown the relations with the States have been conducted by the Governor General in Council through the Foreign and Political Department, various Local Governments, British Officials in the States ; and except in important cases, (it appears from the correspondence between the Governor General and the Princes, for instance from the letters of the Nizam to Lord Reading and Lord Reading to the Nizam) without consulting the Secretary of State. The very fact that the Committee proposes to transfer the charge of the Indian States from the Governor-General-in-Council to the Viceroy shows that till now the relations of the States were kept with the Government of India and not with the British Crown.

(5) “ Since the transfer of the Government of India to the Crown, British India’s relations with foreign powers including the making of treaties etc.,—are conducted in the name of the Crown as Ruler of British India and on behalf of British India ; so are the relations of British India with the Indian States conducted in the name of the Crown, as Ruler of British India.

“It is thus clear that the relations of the States are with the Government of British India, which was vested in the East India Company till 1858 and has since been vested in the Crown, who acts through the Governor-General-in-Council and the other machinery created by the Government of India Acts of 1915 and 1919. The relations with the States have actually been conducted so far by the Governor general in Council. All acts of the Government of India are done in the name of the in whom the Statutes have vested the Government Crown of the country. The Crown is not only King of England (Great Britain), of the Dominions and of Ireland, but also that of British India.”

Inseparable.

Later on Professor Singh adds:—

“Whatever may be the legal or constitutional position, the Indian States and British India are so situated that they cannot but have intimate relations with each other. The geographical position of the States in such that neither they nor an autonomous British India can afford to leave each other alone and go their respective ways.”

Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, the well-known liberal politician and Editor of the “Leader” of Allaha-  
bad presiding over the Indian States Subjects  
Conference said :—

“ India is not only a geographical unit but it is also an economic and national unit as well. The case of Ulster is very different. Ulster is inhabited by men of different race and religion, and even the economic interests of Southern Ireland are different from those of Northern Ireland. The attempt to make the States an Indian Ulster is bound to fail and the only result would be to strengthen a revulsion of feelings in the minds of Indians, both “ British and Indian ” against the Princes.

The Committee of the All Parties Conference,  
 Nehru Reports' Assurance, popularly known as the Nehru  
 Committee, discussing the subjects,  
 writes :

“ The Crown under the Constitution does not mean the King alone. It is a convenient constitutional phrase used to indicate the King-in-Parliament. We think, however, that the plain fact ought not to be overlooked that Government of India as a Dominion will be as much the King's Government as the present Government of India is and that there is no constitutional objection to the Dominion Government of India stepping into the shoes of the present Government of India.”

After guaranteeing to the Princes the sanctity of their treaties, the Nehru Committee says:—

“ In regard to matters of a justiciable character, we have suggested that in case of difference between the Commonwealth and an Indian State on any matters arising out of the treaty engagement, sanads or similar other documents, the Governor-General-in-Council may, with the consent of the State concerned, refer the said matter to the supreme Court for its decision. We think that this will be a far better method of settling such matters than the present arrangement under which the Government of India is both a party and a judge in a controversy between itself and an Indian State.”

This is exactly what the latter part of clause 8 of the creed of the Nizam's Subjects' League quoted above is aiming at. Para 308 of the Montford report enunciates the same principle, namely that of an impartial and independent arbitration in all cases of disputes.

The anxiety of the Britishers to persuade the Princes to accept the theory of direct relationship with the Crown is natural and understandable, as, with the help of this theory, they wish to perpe-

Unnatural and  
Anti-National.

tuates their hold over this country by keeping the army and finances in their own hands. But what is unnatural, unpardonable and anti-nationalistic is the insistence of the Princes that their relations are directly with the Crown. By this attitude, the Princes have lent colour to the view that they do not trust their own countrymen. Since, a large majority of the Princes have hitherto been consistent supporters of British rule even to the detriment of India's national interests, they are probably afraid that when Indian Nationalists come into their own, they will wreak their vengeance on the Princes.

The Nehru Report and various other authoritative nationalist utterances contain profuse assurances which clearly indicate that when British India attains her full measure of responsible Government, she will deal with the Princes in a manner not unworthy of India's age long traditions of forgiveness, forbearance and tolerance. 'Live and let Live' will, I am certain by their guiding motto. The Princes, too must work in the same spirit. They should not put forward theories that are calculated to retard India's progress. The Princes, as a class, have publicly and on several occasions supported India's demand of full-fledged

Dominion Status. They must do nothing that would have the effect of depriving India of the substance of Dominion Status. The best safeguard of the Princes is the loyal co-operation of their own subjects and the good-will and confidence of their countrymen.


Mr. Fenner Brockway, M.P. and Leader of the I.L.P. in his "Indian Crisis" makes the following suggestion on this subject :—

Mr. Brockway's  
Via Media.

"During the transitional period, the relationship of the Indian State to the Indian Government would probably have to remain through the British Crown, but an effort should be made to secure some form of immediate co-operation between the States and the central Indian Legislature, with a view to the treaties being transferred to the Indian Government when the transition period had concluded."

If the Princes have not the courage to declare openly today that their relations are with the Government of British India and should continue to remain with them, no matter what changes take place in the constitution or personnel of the said Government, then I would recommend for their acceptance. Mr. Brockway's suggestion which

implies that the Princes must not commit themselves whole-hog to the new-fangled theory of direct relationship with the Crown but reserve to themselves the right to declare at any further stage that they are willing to have direct relations with the neighbouring Government of British India without the gratuitous medium of the Crown. That is the least that India expects of the Princes.



## CHAPTER IX.

### Our Constitutional Position.

This league believes that Hyderabad possesses all sovereign powers, except those that have willingly, explicitly and formally been transferred to the East India Company or its successor the Government of British India. The word "paramountcy" may be used to describe the obligations of the Government of British India, which arise out of the agreed cession by Hyderabad of certain attributes of its sovereignty. This league whole-heartedly and unreservedly endorses the claim of His Exalted Highness in his famous letter to Lord Reading viz :—

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' League.

Clause IX.

"Save and except matters relating to foreign powers and policies, the Nizams of Hyderabad have been independent in the internal affairs of their State, just as much as the British Government in British India. With the reservation mentioned by me,

the two parties have on all occasions acted with complete freedom and independence in all inter - Governmental questions that naturally arise from time to time between neighbours."

It appears that the dome in the roof of the India Office in London rests on eight rounded arches in which, supported by cherubs, are eight caskets dedicated to the following eight virtues :—

Lack of  
Friendliness.

Truth, justice, wisdom, faith, charity, prudence, honour and courage.

Mr. A. P. Nicholson, author of the 'Scraps of Paper' has noted that the word "Friendship" is not there. He, therefore observes :—

"The spirit of friendship has been lacking in our interpretation of the treaties with Indian States."

The word I miss in this connection is gratitude and I notice that the spirit of gratitude has been sadly lacking in Britain's dealing with Hyderabad. I say this because gratitude, and tons of it, is due from Britain to Hyderabad. It is no exaggeration to say that Britain owes her Eastern Empire to Hyderabad. As a Hyderabad, I should be ashamed to make this confession but I must state facts as they are.

No State is entitled to a better constitutional position in respect of the Government of British India than Hyderabad ; and yet, paradoxically enough, no State has suffered more in matters of dignity, powers and prestige at the hands of the said Government. The clause quoted above aims at defining the exact constitutional position of the Hyderabad State *vis-a-vis* the Government of British India. In support of this clause numerous quotations can be cited from authorities on the subject.

The position taken up by the promoters of the Nizam's Subjects' League in the above clause finds ample support in the "Joint Opinion" of the five eminent constitutional lawyers of Great Britain who, headed by Sir Leslie Scott, appeared before the Butler Committee on behalf of the Chamber of Princes. The following are a few quotations from the "Opinion" :—

Authoritative  
Support.

"In the analysis of the relationship between the contracting parties, legal principles must be enunciated and applied."

"The Indian States possess all original sovereign powers except in so far as any have been transferred to the other contracting party, will-

ingly, explicitly and formally. In cases where transference of sovereign powers has been made informally, the onus to prove the agreement is on the transferee."

As Hyderabad was virtually an independent State possessed of full sovereign powers when it came in contact with the East India Company, so does it remain independent, except to the extent to which any part of the Nizam's sovereignty has been, if at all, transferred to the Company or its successors the Government of British India.

"The Crown has no sovereignty over any State by virtue of the prerogative or any source other than cession from the ruler of the State. The idea that the Crown possesses sovereign rights not so transferred is erroneous. It is to be observed that Lee Warner does not include Paramountcy in the list of channels through which, in his view, rights and obligations are created. In its correct sense, Paramountcy is not a factor in creating any rights or obligations but merely a name for a certain set of rights when vested by consent in another sovereign State. We regard the idea that Paramountcy, as such, creates any powers at all as wholly wrong and the resort to

Paramountcy as an unlimited reservoir of discretionary authority over the Indian States is based upon a radical misconception of what Paramountcy means."

The "Joint Opinion" has the following note on "Sanads" and "Usage." two of the terms used by the Government of British India to curtail the powers and privileges of Indian Princes.

"A Sanad by way of grant can have no operative effect as a grant if the grantee already has the power which the Sanads purport to grant. The machinery of a Sanad cannot be used so as to curtail the powers of the ruler."

"Usage cannot vary the treaties or agreement between the States and the Crown, because of itself it does not create any right or impose any new obligation. Acquiescence in a particular act or a particular series of acts *prima facie* does nothing more than authorise the doing of those particular acts on particular occasions when acquiescence is so given. No agreement can underlie usage, unless both the contracting parties intend to make one."

The Crown has by the mere cession to it of

What is paramountcy? paramountcy acquired no right to control the independent action of any State in matters lying outside the special field so ceded.

So far as Hyderabad is concerned, it has, according to certain authorities, transferred nothing, not even the conduct of its foreign relations. Hence, Hyderabad "remains free to guide its action by considerations of self interest and to make what bargain with the Government of India it may choose."

Principle of Arbitration. "The fact that the States have abandoned the right to settle by force of arms disputes which may arise between them clearly impose upon the Crown the duty to provide some reasonably just and efficient machinery of an impartial kind for their adjustment."

Absence of such a provision, it will be recalled, had evoked from the Nizam the caustic remark namely "Judge and party in one is an arrangement that leaves much to be desired."

Vagaries of the Political Department. Having enunciated the principles laid down by the five eminent British lawyers, I shall now give a few quotations from Mr. A. P. Nicholson's "Scraps of Paper" to show how the Political

Department have acquitted themselves in a manner derogatory and detrimental to the interest of the States.

Writes Mr. Nicholson:—

“ The system in brief is that our political officers in supervising the treaties interpose their authority between the ruler and his subjects; interfere with the internal administration of the State; take possession of lands and impose taxes; force the British Indian regime on Princes against their judgement and diminish their sovereignty. It is a difficult task to support such practices against contrary provisions in Treaties upheld by Royal Proclamation, and it was not long before Political Secretaries or Foreign Secretaries as they were called felt the need of a philosophy to justify their irregular procedure.

“ Various theories are propounded, one of which was that the transfer of the East India Company to the Crown implied a new subordination of the States. Another was that the Departmental interpretation of Treaty engagements had the effect of Law, and constituted “Indian Political Law” a phrase which was minted. When by the action of the Department, the rights of a State

Some Absurd and  
False Theories.

under its treaty were encroached upon, this breach was cited as a precedent for future conduct. In course of time it was felt that a collection of these encroachments would provide a body of case law, or usage, by which officers might be guided in supervising the treaties. The man to make the desired collection of case law was discovered in the Department forty years ago.

Tupper's Confidential Book.

“This was Sir Charles Lewis Tupper, who specialised in Treaty lore, and had privately printed a brochure on the philosophy of the subject. At the request of his Chief he compiled a book of leading cases illustrating our political conduct towards the States. This work on “practice”, which is jealously guarded, was issued to the service confidentially, and is still the basis of the Department’s policy. When the Princes asked to see a copy of Tupper’s book so that they might instruct their Counsel, Sir Leslie Scott, on the vital issues submitted to the Harcourt Butler Committee, their request was refused by the ‘India Office’.

Some Baseless Claims.

“When the book was first prepared, Sir Lewis Tupper, not wishing to hide his light under a bushel, published in 1893 his work on “Our Indian

Protectorate", but although this contained only the non-confidential part of his investigations, it caused some perturbation. It embodied the broad policy of the Department, yet their officers were not anxious to be identified publicly with sentiments held privately or even officially. The point of view advanced was calculated to shock public opinion. Tupper argued in so many words that all the States being "Feudatory", (a controversial expression), were subordinate to the Government of India, and he drew the inference that since that Government was created by Parliament, both Governments might do what they pleased with the States. The native rulers were agents, or great hereditary officers, for administering part of our varied possessions. There was much learning displayed, but these doctrines emerged too nakedly. So it was decided that another book must be written by an officer of the Department to remove the impression that the Government of India considered that they might govern the States as they pleased.

Royal Proclamations Thrown to the Winds.

"The second High Priest to be chosen was Sir William Lee-Warner, who served in the Department, and was afterwards an influential Secretary at the India Office. His book

“The Protected Princes of India”, published in 1894, and revised in 1910 under the title “The Native States of India”, professed to recognise the binding force of Treaties and agreements with the States; although its effect is to show that the Treaties are not binding. This is the paradox which the Political Department are obliged to propound when endeavouring to harmonise their practice with the Royal Proclamations. **Queen Victoria announced that all treaties and engagements made with Native Princes should be scrupulously maintained; her successors to the Crown renewed the pledge; and yet the Department have broken the Treaties.** So Sir William Lee Warner, although inspired to put a better face upon the matter than Sir Lewis Tupper, was obliged to balance upon a fence.

“At the outset he duly lectured his colleague, if Sir Lewis Tupper’s arguments are to be taken seriously they would warrant the conclusion that the Native States being feudatories are ‘British Possessions’, and this would assuredly nullify the solemn assurances given to their rulers”. But this said, he proceeded to explain that the Treaties are subject to the fretting action of consuetudinary law. ‘The judgment of the British Government

King Log for King  
Stork.

upon issues raised with the Native States test the Treaties by the touchstone of practical application'. These judgments became 'the established usage, and the source of rights, even if there were no tacit agreement. Moreover, the States were "members of the same family", and therefore, "as the necessity arose" any Treaty obligation imposed on one might be applied to all. By a study of all the treaties taken together the Government arrived at "the customary treatment accorded to the leading sovereigns". This was the practice of "Extensive interpretation". In support of the Department's general policy towards treaties, Sir William invoked "the onward movement of mankind", and in the end satisfied himself that the Paramount Power had the right to assert their jurisdiction "to a great or less extent" in every Native State.

"Thus there was not much difference in essentials between his book and that of Sir Lewis Tupper, which in one respect was fortunate as the Political Department continue to instruct their officers in political practice by distributing to them Sir Lewis Tupper's secret work."

The above quotations will show how specious

High handed and  
Arbitrary.

were the arguments used by the Political Department to justify its high-handedness.

“Such things are not condemned only because the facts have remained hidden. It is the system which is at fault for the department do not supervise, they govern; and their Government is arbitrary because it is divorced from criticism and control. This is their ‘practice’ when it is stripped of casuistry” observes Mr. Nicholson.

The result has been, in the words of the same writer, “the development of British India to which the interests of the States have been made subservient.” This is so far as practice went.

In the domain of theory, slowly but surely, the dignity of the rulers was undermined by the use of unwarranted words. As soon as the Political Department took over the task of compiling Imperial Gazetteers, they not only edited the history of the States but diminished the prestige of the rulers, for instance ‘dynasty’ was altered to “family;” “close alliance” became “agreement;” the word “throne” is changed into ‘gadi’ and so on.

In the drafting of the official programme at Darbar, Residents and Agents got precedence over Princes. Mr. Nicholson remarks:—

“Under this editorial process of the Political Department, the Indian States have suffered most.”

“To take a salient example, the facts in regard to our acquisition of the Nizam’s Province of Berar are suppressed. The Harcourt Butler Committee adopted the official accounts without even mentioning the Hyderabad contingent. Part of the truth was told by Sir Charles Aitchison in the first edition of his treaties published in 1864, when he pointed out that some of the difficulties which he described in the State of Hyderabad where due to the corrupt and oppressive regime of Chandulal “who was entirely dependent on British influence for his elevation to power.” The whole of this passage is deleted in the latter official edition and an encomium on Chandulal is substituted.”

A more glaring example of *Suppressio Veri*, *Suggestio Falsi*, can hardly be found.

The real difficulty has arisen because of Britain’s intoxication of military power and her over-estimation of her own constitutional position.

One thing has to be made definitely clear and that is that the British Government in India has never

Intoxication of  
power.

succeeded to the titles of the Moghal Emperors, so far as Hyderabad is concerned. Hyderabad had sentimental ties with the Moghal Emperors a relationship that cannot be manufactured in that great factory of perversions called the "Political Department." The ties that bind Hyderabad and British India are purely contractual.

As Mr. Pannikar says the claim of Britishers in India that the mantle of the descendants of Akbar and Aurangzeb has fallen on their shoulders is a phantasmagoric theory of imaginative officers and there is nothing in law or in history to support it.

It will be remembered that in the year 1877 when the late Queen Victoria assumed the title of the Empress of India, Gladstone, in the course of a memorable debate, asked in the House of Commons if the assumption of the new title would make any difference to the position of the Princes of India. Disraeli, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, replied in the negative.

The following is an extract from Mr. Gladstone's speech:—

"I am under the belief that to the moment there are Princes and States in India over which we have never assumed dominion whatever may

have been our superiority of strength. We are bound to ask the Right Honourable gentleman whether he can assure as on his own responsibility that no political change in the condition of the Native Princes of India will be affected by this bill.

Mr. Disraeli replied: "This change of title does not in the least affect the rights and dignity or honour of Native Princes in India."

When Lord Lytton, who was all for pomp and glory, conceived the fantastic idea of an assembly of Princes, Nepal and Afghanistan refused to attend, while the Nizam did so under coercion and threat. Those who have read Sarwar-ul-Mulk's "My life" will recall the controversy that raged between Mr. Saunders, the then Resident at Hyderabad, on the one hand and Sir Salar Jung and the Amir-i-Kabeer on the other, on the question of taking young Mir Mahboob Ali Khan to Bombay to receive the Prince of Wales. Were it not for the intercession of the young Princes' grand-mother, matters would have taken a serious turn.

All these things go to show that every encroachment on the position and the dignity of the State has been tolerated under protest.

What were the results of such encroachments will be seen from the following quotation that describe the havoc wrought by British Intervention in our affairs. Not only were the effects of intervention harmful, but even the intentions were far from benevolent.

I will quote no less a man than Mr. Blunt  
Blunt's blunt Truths: (Lord Byron's son-in-law and a personal friend of Lord Ripon) to prove the charge.

Writes Mr. Blunt in his "India under Ripon" referring to the period after the death of Mukhtar-ul-Mulk :—

" Affairs had got into a bad state. This was encouraged by the Residency whose policy it was to show that the Native Government was unfit to keep order in the country."

On another occasion Mr. Blunt writes as follows :—

" The Residency, of course, supports the Peshkar party as they get more power by working through the reactionaries opposed to reform, precisely as in Egypt. The arbitrary power of the Resident here is beyond belief."

Referring to Major Clerk the Nizam's tutor, Mr. Blunt writes "Cordery (Resident) is trying to get rid of him, too, as he is an independent man and is honest in looking to the Nizam's interests, instead of those of the Calcutta Foreign Office..... The policy seems to be to keep the Hyderabad nobles in ignorance of modern thought and it also looks as if the Indian Government encourages the bad administration purposely."

As a result of his independent study, Mr. Blunt came to the conclusion that :—

"Never trust the Resident."

**"The essential in any settlement of the Hyderabad problem is to remember that the Resident cannot be trusted to advise for good."**

In a letter to Mr. Blunt, Major Clerk writes "When Salar Jung asked me to take up the appointment, I determined to hold myself entirely aloof from the Simla clique and its ways of which I was not an admirer."

Referring to Cordery, Major Clerk writes

"Cordery was bound hand and foot by the action of those with whom he was associated and they were supporting the very party in the city who had determined on the moral ruin of the Nizam in the two years' prolongation of the

minority, during which they would have kept the lid of the treasury open, without scruple of any sort or kind."

Referring to the differences between the late Nizam and his Minister Mir Laik Ali Khan, Major Clerk writes "The differences, originally a mere trifle, were skilfully fanned by the bribed members of the Nizam's and Diwan's entourage."

Even assuming for a moment—although such an assumption is not warranted by facts—that intervention was actuated by benevolent motives, let us examine its results.

Results of  
Intervention.

Lord Auckland, writing to General Fraser in 1839 says : "Frequent intervention on our part would make us liable for evil and do but little good. I do not approve in our dealing with the Nizam of that ostentatious assumption of what we call 'Paramount power,' which the Government habitually exhibit in an offensive degree."

In this pamphlet entitled "Claims of the Nizam " Col. Hasting Fraser writes : "It is apparent that from first to last a retrospect of our relations with the Nizam should be carefully avoided by resolute sticklers for the perfection of British Rule. Few chapters of its history, it is to

be hoped, are so calculated to tax either the credulity of its devotees or the versatile audacity of hirelings."

There is no dearth of authoritative evidence to prove that British intervention  
*Decaying Villages.* has had the most demoralising and harmful effect on the State.

Referring to the result of the intervention and the military burden imposed on the State, Sir Thomas Munro writes: "This system has the natural tendency to render the Government of every country in which it exists weak and oppressive ; to extinguish all honourable spirit among the higher classes of society, to degrade and impoverish the whole people. Wherever this system is introduced, the country will soon bear the marks of it in decaying villages and decreasing population. This has long been observed in the dominions of the Peshwas and the Nizam."

Lord Cornwallis, writing to Lord Lake on 30th August 1805, remarks on the  
*Forlorn Condition.* same phenomenon. "From reports I have received from the Resident, I am sorry to find that the States who are most intimately connected with us are reduced to the most forlorn condition."

In a leading circle, the London "Times" commenting on the affairs of the Indian States in 1855 remarks that the result of unwarranted military burden on the State treasuries and intervention in the affairs of the State has been "A chronic anarchy under which the revenues of the States are dissipated between the mercenaries of the camp and the minions of the court. The heavy and arbitrary taxes levied on the miserable ryots serve only to feed the meanest and the most degraded of mankind."

No Right to Intervene.	The Government of British India or its predecessors had no legal or moral right to interfere in our internal administration.
------------------------	--

Even an imperialist Like Lord Dalhousie wrote thus:—

"This Government disclaims not only the intention but the wish of doing any act by which the independence of the Nizam can be in any degree impaired. The treaty itself offers a bar to any such designs by declaring in the most emphatic terms that the Government of India binds itself in no way to interfere with His Highness' subjects, servants or concerns."

General Fraser writes:—"The Nizam's Government is a sovereign and independent one and I perceive nothing in the present state which would justify any infraction of that independence which would be involved in an authoritative or violent interference on our part."

Col. Hastings Fraser writes: "The sovereignty and the independence of the Nizam, as acknowledged by every Governor-General and Viceroy without exception, down to the present day rests on solemn treaties. The Nizam is not and never has been either a feudatory or a tributary to the British Government. The Hyderabad State has on the contrary, for a long series of years, paid subsidy for services to the British Government and received from it a tribute for provinces held in feudal tenure under it. The Nizam's position, at present, under treaty, is that of a sovereign prince and a protected ally of the Queen."

I have not the slightest doubt that when Sir Richard Temple in his article on Hyderabad's real Status. "India" published in the Chamber's Encyclopaedia observed that "Some are practically independent sovereigns", he was decidedly referring to Hyderabad.

In his commentary upon International Law (Sec. 29), Sir Robert Phillimore writes that the principle of International justice should govern the dealings of Great Britain with the Native Princes of India.

Even Sir William Lee Warner says that the "principles and even the language of International Law, as well as justice, was properly applied to the Indian State."

Mr. Pannikar has throughout his various works on the problems of Indian States, referred to Hyderabad as a full-powered and sovereign State.

If any further proof were needed of the relative position of the two contracting parties, it is best furnished in the historic letter that Mukhtar-ul-Mulk wrote to Sir John Lawrence, at the instance of Nawab Afzal-ud-Dowlah Bahadur. It so happened that the province of Orissa was ravaged by flood and famines. The late Sir Salar Jung Bahadur wrote to the following effect :—

“ The Government of Hyderabad are grieved to note that the Government of British India have not been sufficiently mindful of the welfare of their subjects. During the recent Orissa floods,

Sir Salar Jung  
Snubs a Viceroy

lakhs of people have perished owing to the callous indifference of the authorities. It must be remembered that the Government of Hyderabad are to large extent responsible for the establishment and maintenance of British rule in India. Inferentially, they are responsible for the weal and welfare of the people of British India. If the authorities at Orissa are unable to cope with the situation, the Government of British India would be well advised to hand over the province of Orissa to the management of the Government of Hyderabad, who would administer the province in the interests of the people and remit to the British Exchequer the balance of the revenue receipts. Hyderabad cannot sit silent while lakhs are perishing in Orissa, despite the fact that the treasury of the said province is replete with cash."

The above is my own translation of Sir Salar's letter. The point that emerges from it is that both Nawab Afzal-ud-Dowlah and his able Minister were convinced that the obligations arising from the treaties were bilateral and reciprocal, and not unilateral as it is claimed by the protagonists of the Paramountcy theory. In other words, if the existing treaties give to one of the contracting

Reciprocal Rights  
and Obligations.

parties the right of intervention in the interest of India as a whole, so do they give an equal and reciprocal right to the other party. This is the substance of the Nizam's claim of equality of status adumbrated in his letter to Lord Reading. Mr. Pannikar has it that "The Company's treaties with the Vazir or Oudh, the Nizam of Hyderabad and others were as between equals".

It is well known to every student of History that upto the time of Afzal-ud-Dowlah, the grandfather of the present Nizam, the Governor-General used to sign himself as "Niaz Mund", while the Nizams on their part referred to themselves as "Ma Badaulat wa Iqbal". Mir Alam was the Nizam's envoy at the British Court just as Nepal and Afghanistan have today. The Resident of Hyderabad was never allowed a chair in the presence of the Nizam. There is documentary evidence to prove that on a certain Darbar occasion, the Resident petitioned to the Nizam that the practice of squatting on the floor was highly inconvenient to a man who wears breeches and that he should be allowed the use of a chair in the Darbar. The Nizam ordered that a pit should be dug to enable the Resident to hang his feet down and thus was the question settled.

The following is from Sarvar-ul-Mulk's 'My life':—

During the reign of H. H. Afzal-ud-Dowlah it was customary for a Resident to make a request through the Minister for an audience on these occasions. His Highness would take his seat on the 'Masnad'; the Resident with his companions, would sit on the carpet to the right side, bare-headed and without shoes, and to the left the Diwan, the Peshkar and other Great Nobles would be seated."

Are not these eloquent testimonials to the relative position of the two contracting parties? Happily the position is also borne out by treaties.

The issue then resolves itself into this :—

Are the treaties sacred or are they mere scraps of paper? Lloyd George told a bewildered world that Britain was participating in the war to ensure the sanctity of treaties. Hyderabad helped Britain by men, money and munitions to win the Great War. Hyderabad expects that her great contribution to the allied victory will be recompensed in the shape of Britain recognising the sanctity of her treaties with Hyderabad. If that is done, Hyderabad may well expect that the corroding in-roads of paramountcy and its concomitant evils

that have been devitalising Hyderabad for decades past, would cease to exercise their baneful influence over the Nizam's Dominions.

Our critics might insinuate that we are preaching disaffection towards the British Government. Allow me to declare most emphatically that such is not the case. We do wish to maintain cordial relations with our British Allies but we do not want that this alliance should go against our best interests. What is needed is a fair readjustment of our relations in the light of treaties that we consider sacred. Surely that is not asking for too much.

The Nizam's Subjects' League will persistently uphold this position and even if the League is suppressed, the Hyderabadis will never consider themselves vanquished.



## CHAPTER X.

### Federation.

Creed of the Nizam's  
Subjects' League.

Clause X.

The league believes that Federation is the right solution of the Indian problem and that Hyderabad must join it to share the responsibility for the good Government of a United Indian Empire. In joining the Federation, Hyderabad should steer clear of all suspicion that she is doing anything against the best interests of India or is retarding the progress of the country towards its cherished goal of a full-fledged Dominion Status. Hyderabad would not jeopardise its own sovereignty and privileges but if entry into the Federal scheme makes sacrifices inevitable, she would agree to none that is not demonstrably in the interests of a United India.

Federation in the  
Interests of Indian  
India.

There are people in the Indian States who seem to think that a solution of the Indian problem is possible even without a federation. Such forget that by their attitude they are

subordinating themselves to British India. The fact is that, as things stand to-day, there is no such thing as the Government of India in the correct sense of the term and unfortunately for the States, All-India problems are being decided by the Government of British India over the heads of the India States and often greatly to the detriment of the latter a clear case of the part deciding for the whole in its own interests. Taking advantage of the weakness of the Princes, the Government of British India have usurped the functions of the Government of India and utilised their extended influence solely in the interests of Great Britain. The States have foolishly tolerated this highhandedness of the British Indian Government so far. And, although of late they are manifesting signs of restlessness, they are nevertheless yet far from shaking off this yoke. There can be no Government of India in the real sense of the term unless Indian India and British India collaborate conjointly to that end. Hence it is that the States must join the Federation to share the responsibility for the good Government of a United Indian Empire. As Colonel Haksar and Mr. Pannikar have observed in their book entitled "Federal India". "The States in India today submit to the

exercise of an authority they cannot resist. But unless by their consent effective machinery be created in time which shall guarantee their rights while it reserves necessary powers to a common central Government, the future of India may not be bright".

On another occasion the two distinguished writers remark: "In India the tendency towards the aggrandisement of the central power has operated with great vigour but with entire want of discrimination. The result is that the States which negotiated on terms of equality with the Company have been forced to accept a paramountcy which is incredibly wide".

If, therefore, Hyderabad desires to have a voice in the settlement of All India problems, she must join the Federation and save herself the stigma of subordination that would naturally be her lot if she leaves the control of All-India affairs to British Indians alone.

Let us see what are the things essential that would induce the Nizam to join the federation. In the words of Haksar and Pannikar the requirements are :—

The Essentials of  
Federalism.

(i) "The acceptance by the Dominion Government of India of the subsisting treaties as fully binding.

(ii) "The creation of a Supreme Court which would have the right to declare illegal and *ultra vires* any executive or legislative measure which goes against the clauses of a treaty."

(iii) "The creation of an executive body in which the States would have effective representation to decide matters of common concern."

Later on, they say : "A central authority would have to be created by agreement between the federating States, each independent of the other, which would exercise only the powers specifically allotted to it by the constitution or those naturally following therefrom : all other powers being exercised by the constituent States. It is the maintenance of this line of division that is the essence of federalism. Therefore, a federal system presupposes :

(i) "The existence of States independent of each other, willing to enter into a compact for the creation of a central Government."

(ii) "A written constitution supreme over all other instruments of Government which shall

What Federation  
Pre-Supposes.

only be changed according to the process specifically laid down in the constitution itself.

(iii) The allocation of definite powers to the central Government and the provision of a machinery to ensure the effective limitation of the powers in all spheres of Government Legislation, Judicial competence and Executive action.

(iv) The creation of institutions whereby the spirit of Union and the rights of the State shall be maintained.

(v) The existence of judicial power authoritatively to interpret the constitution".

We are not aware what has been the attitude of the Hyderabad delegate to the Round Table Conference towards these problems. In order that the people of Hyderabad may have a chance of satisfying themselves that their rights and privileges have been duly safeguarded, it is essential that our Government should publish a detailed account of the delegate's work in London. It is only then that the subjects of His Exalted Highness will know the exact nature of the commitments. Otherwise, people will draw their own conclusions.

So far as the people are concerned, it must be understood clearly that they would not like that

Hyderabad should prove an obstacle in the path of India's progress. If sacrifices are found inevitable for the sake of the Federation, then the people of Hyderabad would agree to no sacrifice that is not demonstrably in the interest of a United India. That should be the Mulki view-point towards the proposed Federation.

In the course of an article published in the Illustrated Weekly of India dated March 2nd. 1934, Mr. Pannikar refers to the subject of Federal Finance as "the main stumbling block in the way of complete agreement" between the States and British India. "The representatives of the States" he says "pointed out that so far as they were concerned, they were not prepared to agree to any method of direct taxation which would introduce within the State a tax-collecting Agency between them and their people, and further that they were already being taxed indirectly to the limit of their capacity".

"The position of the States was that as federation did not mean any material enlargement in the functions of the Central Government, the existing sources of revenue and methods of taxation should be sufficient to meet its present and future needs,

that if federation did not come at all, the same responsibilities and the same expenditure would have had to be met from the existing sources; and that the States are already paying their quota by indirect taxation, which they are prepared to legalise and continue.

“ The White paper proposals, however, included a corporation tax and a surcharge on incomes, though the Political States to be Taxed. aspect of the States’ demand was sought to be met by a provision that the State Governments would be free to compound the tax by a lump payment of the sum assessed. The main criticism of the White Paper scheme from the State’s point of view was in regard to this provision. The Statement made by Sir Akbar Hydari on behalf of the entire Indian States’ delegation laying down the principles, which the States were prepared to accept in the settlement of this problem would, it is hoped, provide a satisfactory solution”.

Two other serious objections put forward on behalf of the Princes against the White paper proposal related to the classification of subjects under the three heads of.

State's Objection to  
White paper Scheme

(1) Crown Subjects

(2) Federal Subjects

(3) Subjects wholly under the jurisdiction of the federating units.

Mr. Pannikar refers to these objections in the following words:—

“The Princes have very strong objections, indeed to the inclusion of subjects relating exclusively to British India in the list of federal subjects and the inclusion of subjects originally classed as ‘Crown subjects in the list of ‘reserved’ subjects. He adds that the Princes have accepted under protest “the arrangements with regard to the abolition of tributes from the States, valuation of amenities enjoyed by the State as debit items in cases where the States have claims against British India, etc.”

Unless light is thrown by the Hyderabad Government on the stand taken by the delegation on the issues referred to above, I doubt very much if the delegation's commitments would command popular support.

These are matters of vital importance and must be discussed threadbare both in the Press and on the platform.

Take the Mulkis into Confidence.

People of British India apprehend that the entry of the Princes into the Federal Scheme would vitiate the entire constitution, as they would always support British interests as against Indian interests. It is up to the Government of Hyderabad to falsify these fears. Hyderabad has not in the past been very discreet in her dealings with the rest of India. She must make amends for her past indiscretions and errors of judgment by playing the game with India in the future. The people of Hyderabad will never tolerate any Government that will carry on indecent flirtations with those whose interests are antagonistic to India's.



*Post Script*

As a result of the discussion and criticisms that followed the issue of the circular letter published in the earlier part of this book, the creed and aims and objects had to undergo several material and verbal changes.

Nawab Sir Nizam Jung Bahadur, formerly political Minister of our State, scrutinised the document in its amended form and approved of its principles. Other leaders of public opinion also signified their assent to the modified creed by putting their signatures to it.

An informal conference of about 150 prominent citizens of Hyderabad was held in the beginning of February to confirm what had been done so far and to appoint a committee for forming the League. All those who had attended the meeting evinced keen interest in its proceedings, which ended in the election of an influential and representative committee to reconsider the published draft and hit upon a final creed to be placed for confirmation before a public conference.

As it happens, Nawab Sir Nizam Jung Bahadur has been elected president of this provisional committee and the undersigned has been elected secretary. It is only fair to mention

here that the views expressed in this book are my own and need not necessarily be shared by any of my colleagues in the committee or my hundreds of other co-workers who are not in the committee. I have made this clear lest readers might feel disposed to judge the committee itself or the league that is in the process of formation by the stand I have taken up in this book. Needless to add that as secretary of the provisional committee, I shall be bound by its decisions, just as the future secretary of the league will have to abide by its official policy.

I consider it a piece of good fortune that so seasoned and able a politician as Sir Nizamath has assumed the leadership of Mulki-Movement—a fact that provides a sufficient guarantee to everybody concerned that things are pretty sound and safe. The preceding pages had been printed before I was elected secretary of the provisional committee. Hence the need for this Post Script.

*February, 1935.*

S. A. H.



## APPENDIX I.

### **A suggested constitutional scheme for Hyderabad.**

( By “ A constitutional lawyer ” )

After a careful study of the local problems and in consultation with constitutional experts of British India fame, I have prepared a constitutional scheme for Hyderabad, which is given below with a view to elicit public opinion and to start a discussion so that public opinion might crystallise on the subject and be of use to the Government in formulating their own Scheme. I trust that the scheme, will be sympathetically judged.

Outline of  
the scheme.

The scheme assumes that the Nizam is the supreme Head of the State, and that His Exalted Highness delegates his powers to the legislature, reserving to himself the right of veto, which will not be exercised unless in cases of grave emergencies.

The legislature will be Bi-Cameral. The Lower Chamber, to be called the Legislative Assembly, will consist of 100 members. The

upper chamber, to be called the Council of State, will consist of 50 members.

The allotment of Seats in the Assembly would be as follows:—

Govt : members nominated by H. E. H. at the recommendation of the Execu- tive Council	.... 20
Elected Members	... 65
Non-official members nominated by the Executive Council	.... 10
Members Nominated by H. E. H. in the exercise of the Royal prerogative	.... 5
Total	... 100

1. The twenty Government members will include members of the Executive Council and such other officials as Government deem it necessary to nominate to facilitate the work of the Session. They must necessarily include Directors of statistics and Information Bureau.

2. Details of the 65 elected members are as follows:—

Representatives of Rural area	.... 36
„ „ Urban „	... 29
	<hr/> 65

**Distribution of 36 rural seats.**

Aurangabad, Gulbarga, Warrangal and Atraf Bulda to send three representatives each; other 12 Districts to send two members each.

**Distribution of 29 urban seats.**

1. Jagirdars' Association	...	5
2. Hyderabad Municipality	...	5
3. Hyderabad Bar Association	....	3
(Lawyers of ten years' standing alone will be eligible.)		
4. Graduates of ten years' standing	....	3
5. Osmania University Senate	....	2
6. Commercial & Industrial interests.	....	3
7. Banking interests	....	2
8. Assigned areas and Cantonments	...	2
9. Pundits and Sastris	..	2
10. Muslim Ulema (I Sunni and I Shia)	....	2
		<hr/> 29

**Distribution of 10 Nominated Non-Official Seats.**

1. Paighas, Samisthans and such Jagirs as are not members of the Jagirdar association	...	3
2. Harijan interests		2
3. Labour	....	2

4. Women	....	2
5. Unemployment interests		1
		<hr/>
		10

After these results are complete, they will be submitted to H.E.H. for formal confirmation and the Nizam will be requested to add five more names in the exercise of his royal prerogative, to complete the figure of 100. It will be left to the Royal discretion as to how many of these five will represent the interests of the Sarf-i-Khas Mubarak.

The Prime Minister will preside at the Upper House and the political member over the Lower House. Elections will be held every five years, generally in the month of Amardad to be well in time for the budget session which must be held in the beginning of Meher. The second session of the year will be held in Farwardi to discuss Bills and Resolutions.

This scheme assumes that Local self-Government institutions — Municipality and District Boards—are properly constituted on an elective basis with as wide a franchise as is feasible under the present circumstances. The District Local Boards

Indirect Elections  
to start with.

and the Municipality will form the most important constituencies of the Legislative Assembly. In other words, for the present, there will be no direct elections for the Assembly, but the elected representatives of the people in Local Bodies will be asked to elect their representatives to the Assembly. Jagirdars' Association, Bar Association and the Senate are properly constituted constituencies. They can, therefore, elect representatives straight off. But they should, however, try to make themselves more and more representative. The other interests concerned should devise their own proper constituencies—fully representative—and obtain Government's sanction.

With regard to the nominated seats too, Government would be well advised to encourage elective system by nominating such as are elected by the recognised bodies concerned.

#### Details of the Upper House.

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Officials (including Executive Council) |    |
| nominated by H.E.H. on the recom-          |    |
| mendation of the Executive Council ...     | 20 |
| 2. Nominated by H.E.H. in exercise of the  |    |
| Royal prerogative ...                      | 5  |

3. Paigahs, Samasthans and Jagirs	17
4. Retired Officials and Jemadars	8
	<hr/> 50

The last named two interests should form their own constituencies for the purpose of their elections and send representatives.

As regards the relations of the two houses with reference to the powers exercised by them, the British Parliamentary procedure may be followed.

Follow British  
Parliamentary  
Procedure.

The legislatures will be empowered to discuss all matters of public importance, including Federal matters, excepting such as H.E.H., on the recommendation of the Executive Council, decides that it would not be in public interest to discuss them in the open House. With regard to such matters, the Executive Council will take the leaders of the opposition into their confidence and satisfy them that secrecy is being maintained purely in public interests.

The Legislative Department will be under the Political member. The Legislative Secretary will be Secretary to the Upper House. The Under-Secretary

Peshkash-Non-  
Votable.

tary Legislative Department will be Secretary in the Lower House. The proceedings of both the Houses will be open to the press. All items in the Budget will be votable, except the Peshkash to His Exalted Highness.

Matters relating exclusively either to Jagirdars or to the two major communities in the State, will not be declared to have been decided by the Legislatures, when two-third of the members of the class or community concerned vote solidly against it, unless the decision of the legislature is sanctioned by the Firman also.

As Muslims in the rural areas happen to be very backward, both economically and educationally, it should be laid down by mutual consent that at least 45% of the rural seats should be reserved for them. In other words, out of the 36 rural seats, even if 16 Muslims are returned, say one representing each district, it will help rural Muslims a great deal. This arrangement need not form a clause in the constitution ; it is enough if it is laid down as a convention.

A Convention.

## APPENDIX II.

### Mulki Movement in Hyderabad.

What it stands for ?

(By "A MULKI")

As references have recently been made in the press to, what is known as, the Mulki Movement in the Hyderabad State, I should like to explain here at some length what this movement, as I understand it, stands for.

Soon after the great debacle of 1857, when things had quietend down a bit,  
The Genesis: Sir Salar Jung I, who was then at the helm of affairs in Hyderabad, began to overhaul the administrative machinery and to introduce various reforms. Finding that there were not enough capable Hyderabadees to fill all the big posts in the State Service, he imported some of those who had gathered round Sir Saiyid Ahmad Khan to help the establishment of the Aligarh College.

It was understood that this importation would just be a temporary expedient and  
What was Expected of them, that it would not form a precedent for future recruitment. The gentlemen, thus invited, were told that before the expiry

of their term of office they should train their local assistants to undertake higher responsibilities and to fill the places of their outgoing superiors.

Unfortunately for Hyderabad, Sir Salar's expectations did not come true. Not only was local talent studiously suppressed, but fresh opportunities were created to import more and more outsiders. And it has since become almost a tradition to look for men, outside the Dominions, when any vacancy occurs.

An Unhealthy  
Tradition.

How long could this State of affairs be tolerated by Hyderabad? Thanks to the Osmania University and to the liberal educational policy of the Nizam's Government in granting scholarships and loans to candidates desirous of prosecuting higher studies abroad, there are thousands of highly educated Hyderabaders who naturally resent bitterly their claims to enter State service, being lightly passed over. That is one factor.

Intolerable  
Position.

It is felt, and very rightly too, that a non-Hyderabadiee cannot as jealously safeguard the interests of the State as a Hyderabadiee would naturally

A Psychological  
Factor.

do. He cannot evince the same degree of loyalty towards the Ruler and the same amount of affection and sympathy for the people of Hyderabad, as a local man would.

Furthermore, I must be pardoned if I observe that the harmonious relations between Hindus and Muslims, that have always been a distinguishing feature of Corporate life in Hyderabad, would not have been disturbed, if gentlemen from abroad had not persistently meddled with our affairs. Between certain fanatical British Indian Muslims on the one hand and a few bigoted British Indian Mahasabhaites on the other, the once bright and cheery atmosphere of mutual goodwill and trust in Hyderabad has been somewhat darkened by clouds of suspicion and distrust.

There is also the economic aspect of this question. Since non-Hyderabad-ees have been occupying the key positions in the State, all the favours in their gift (such as contracts, trade monopolies, licenses, orders for the supply of materials etc.) have been and are being bestowed mostly on outsiders. This has meant a continuous drain of wealth from Hyderabad.

Persons who come to Hyderabad either for jobs or to exploit other economic fields do not, as a rule, settle down here for good. Nor do they become naturalised subjects of H. E. H. the Nizam. Neither do they invest their earnings in the Dominions. In majority of cases, they are mere birds of passages who stay in Hyderabad primarily for pecuniary purposes and send remittances every month to their respective homes. All this is highly detrimental to the best interests of the State.

It is common knowledge that Hyderabad has always been very liberal in giving charities and grants. In fact, there are special funds for this purpose. As the sanctioning authorities have always been outsiders, institutions and persons, outside the Dominions, have been disproportionately favoured. This has deprived local causes of the support that was due to them.

A realisation of the above factors has given birth to what is known as the Mulki Movement, essentially, it is a constructive movement. Its main plank is that the people of Hyderabad,

Birds of Passage.

Charity not at Home?

A Constructive Movement.

irrespective of class and creed, should rally round the Asaf Jahi banner and claim their birth right of enhancing by **their** services, the glory of their Sovereign and the prosperity of their State.

The Movement postulates that the privilege of serving the State belongs to  
 A Few Axioms.                      Hyderabadtees, the privilege of profiting by the economic resources of the State belong to them, the privilege of laying down the administrative policy of the State belongs to them, the privilege of deciding what is or is not good for the State belongs to them. Hyderabadtees claim these privileges because it is they who enjoy the pride of being the subjects of His Exalted Highness the Nizam. Their claim is based on no other ground.

Since the Mulki Movement believes in the establishment of a Constitutional  
 A Constitutional Movement.                      form of Government, under the aegis of the Asaf Jahi Dynasty—a Government that would give due place to vested interests (Viz the aristocracy, the holders of Samasthans and Jagirs, the Jamadars and Deshmukhs etc.) in its Counsels and would not admit of any particular class or community dominating

over the others—it naturally eschews all unconstitutional methods for the realisation of its aims.

The Mulki Movement believes that the aristocracy of Hyderabad, the holders of Samasthans and Jagirs and similar other institutions with a historical past, institutions which are at present, rightly or wrongly, considered by some to be so many centres of reactionary and obscurantist forces, have great potentialities for being good and doing good. It is one of the aims of this movement to respect and preserve these historic institutions—these relics of Hyderabad's glorious past—and to see that they constitute themselves into so many agencies for doing good and by their efforts enhance the glory of their sovereign and the wealth and welfare of the people.

The Mulki Movement, in short, while cementing the bonds of sympathy and goodwill between the various communities and classes that owe allegiance to His Exalted Highness would resist to the very last any exploitation of the economic resources of the State by outsiders and any encroachments on the political integrity and status of the State. “Hyderabad is our State and the

Preserving  
Historical  
Institutions.

Hyderabad for  
Hyderabadese.

Nizam represents and embodies our sovereignty”  
—that is the slogan of this movement.

Such being the aims and ideals of this Movement, it is difficult to imagine how any well-wisher of Hyderabad and its people, can possibly refrain from extending his or her sympathies to it.

All that now remains to be said is that it is upto those, who are organising  
Anti-Nobody. and leading this movement in Hyderabad, to see that it is conducted on healthy and constitutional lines and that nothing is said or done that is likely to smack of hatred or malice against anybody. The movement must continue to remain pro-Hyderabad. It must never degenerate into anti-anybody. Only then can the movement expect to get the sympathy and support of the saner elements outside the Dominions.

**LONG LIVE THE NIZAM !**



## APPENDIX III.

### **The Ethics and Politics**

OF

### **The “Mulki Movement.”**

( BY “ A MULKI ” )

Interested persons are trying to misrepresent the “Mulki Movement” of Hyderabad. The main charges against the Movement are as follows :—

1. The Movement is parochial and narrow in its outlook, in as much it tends to divide India into water tight compartments.

What our Critics say.

2. The Movement is anti-British at the bottom.

3. The Movement is confined solely to obtaining jobs in State service.

4. The Movement has for its basis a Firman of His Exalted Highness issued in connection with a particular appointment, and, therefore, if the Firman is rescinded, the Movement will collapse.

5. The Movement is the ingenious creation of the Hindu Mahasabhaitees, who have roped in

the simple and credulous Hyderabad Muslims for their own communal ends.

6. The Movement has been engineered by certain vested interests who have managed to get hold of some public workers to gain personal ends.

7. The Movement is made more fuss of than it really deserves.

8. The Movement is ill-timed in as much as, while India is talking of Federation, Hyderabad is trying to bury its own head, ostrich-like.

9. If the Movement (irrespective of what it stands for) is allowed to have its own way, it may assume dangerous proportions, when it will be difficult to control it.

10. And lastly, it is believed, even by some well meaning people, that this movement will die out if a dozen or two of its active workers are removed from their scene of activity.

I have summarised above all the possible charges that have been levelled against our movement, and I propose to refute them *seriatum*. The replies will elucidate the ethical basis and the political trend of the Mulki Movement of Hyderabad.

I. You cannot create a strong Federal India unless and until you make every unit of that Federation a strong and organic unit. If the Mulki Movement is Parochial and narrow, so is the demand for provincial autonomy that is being urged by every British Indian province. With the help of this movement, we propose and hope to raise the political and economic status of Hyderabad to a level that will enable it to prove itself to be a useful federating unit. As such, those who oppose the Mulki Movement in Hyderabad are the masked enemies of a successful Indian Federation.

Secondly, it is a healthy accepted principle of public administration that the nationals of a State alone can be its best and trustworthy servants. When, on the recommendation of the Inchcape Commission and the Lee commission, the Government of India sanctioned the scheme of the provincialisation of services, they acted according to certain well-defined tents, and the experience of the last decade has shown that Government took the right step. The same has been the case in Mysore and other important States. Their progress dates from the day they decided to harness local talent in the

Preparing for The  
Future.

A Sound Principle.

State Service. What is food for all, cannot be poison for us.

The Movement is anti-nobody. It is just pro  
Hyderabadi. Those, who suspect  
that this Movement will tend to be  
anti-British, really insinuate that  
the British people are the enemies of Hyderabad's  
progress; otherwise, why do they apprehend that  
our Movement would come in a clash with British  
interests? This is a libel on the British people,  
and it is upto them to protect themselves against  
such defamatory attacks.

The insinuation becomes more serious in  
view of the fact that British people have no  
justification or provocation to oppose any healthy,  
constructive and constitutional movement, design-  
ed and calculated to restore Hyderabad to its  
political greatness and to promote the weal and  
welfare of its people. After all, Britishers know  
their History in India too well. Why would they  
stand in the way of the very State that has helped  
them in times of crises.

We have no reason to believe that Britishers  
themselves would ever consider  
our Movement as opposed to their  
genuine and legitimate interests. Britishers are

A Libel on  
Britishers.

A Constitutional  
Movement.

a constitution-loving people, and we are sure they like every constitutional movement. The Movement, we announce once again, is anti-nobody ; it is just pro-Hyderabadi.

It will certainly fight, if necessary, the enemies of Hyderabad's progress. But why do our Non-Mulki friends assume that Britishers will be among them ? It is not love of Britain but love of self that prompts them to say so. It is a mean but transparent trick to seek refuge behind supposed British interests. The trick will cut no ice.

3. The third charge has been authoritatively refuted publicly by the organising Secretary himself. He has clarified the issues in his recent press statement published in many leading papers in India.

4. The Movement does not owe its origin to the recent gracious Firman of His Exalted Highness. It did, no doubt, receive great impetus from that Firman. The fact of the matter, however, was that the situation in the country was ripe for the inauguration of a vigorous and dynamic All-Hyderabad Movement, calculated to remedy the various social, political and economic ills that our

A Transparent  
Trick.

Movement was  
Called for.

glorious State has fallen a prey to, thanks to the awful mess that outsiders—barring honourable exceptions—have made of its entire structure. The Firman came at the right and opportune moment and gave the necessary start.

5. The subjects of His Exalted Highness refuse to recognise distinction of creeds. There is no such thing in the vocabulary of the “Mulki Movement” as Hindu or Muslim. We are all Hyderabadies, and every movement that raises the political and economic stature of Hyderabad is our Movement. Such is the mentality that we wish to inculcate and maintain. We will crush with all the vigour that we can command every effort to introduce communalism in politics, by whomsoever made, fully confident of the support and sympathy of all lovers of peace and harmony.

6. The movement supports the aristocracy and the nobility of Hyderabad because the movement believes that members of this order constitute pillars of strength to the Hyderabad throne, which embodies in itself all that is good, great and glorious in the State. When aristocracy ceases to be what we hope and wish it should be, then

We Are Non-  
Communal In  
Politics.

Our Attitude  
Towards  
Aristocracy.

the Movement will not hesitate to conduct an iconoclastic campaign against this order. Such being our ideals, how can any one suppose that the sponsors of this movement are in the leading strings of the vested interests? We do expect financial and moral support from all Jagirdars and nobles for every philanthropic and nation-building movement, but that does not mean that we would subserve popular interests to their dictates.

7. With regard to this aspersion, suffice it to say that our detractors have seen just the fringe of our great publicity campaign. The real campaign is yet to come, and they will have to reckon with a good deal more of it in the near future. Then, will they realise how all-embracing and important this movement is.

There's More  
Ahead.

8. This point has been cleared above. We are paving the way towards a strong and real Federation and not the farce that is in the air just now.

Towards Real  
Federation.

9. He will be a bold prophet who would dare to make predictions in politics. Why assume, at the very start, that the movement will take an unhealthy turn? If it has a good moral basis, as

it undoubtedly has, if it is well-intentioned, as it obviously is; if it is properly conducted, as it has been so far; then we have no hesitation in attributing all misgivings about the movement to the veiled opposition of our detractors.

10. If the "Mulki Movement" of Hyderabad were the creation of those who are working for it and in it, then it will surely die out the moment the workers are clapped. But, happily for Hyderabad, such is not the case. The movement has created workers; it is not workers who have created the movement.

Of the two principal elements in the State viz. the Ruler and the Ruled, the Discontent from top to Bottom. deplorable fact is that both are discontented, because neither of them occupies the position and enjoys the prestige that it deserves. Among the Ruled, there is the aristocratic order, the Hindu subjects and the Muslim subjects. Not one of these is contented, though it may be for different reasons.

There was a time when the Rulers of Hyderabad were the "monarchs of all they surveyed, with none to dispute their rights". If the Governor-General of India had something to convey to

How Things Have Changed.

our Ruler, he could do so only in the "Niazmandana" spirit. Alas! those days are no more!

The aristocracy finds today that it has lost all influence in the State, that it has to wait at the door of officialdom to get petty things done, that the future of Hyderabad is being carved out without their being taken into confidence and so on. There was a time, not very far off, when our nobility had a preponderating voice in chalking out our policies. Today they simply do not count. It is a tragedy of the times we are passing through

There was a time, not very far off, when  
Asaf Jahi Creed In  
Politics.
Hindus and Muslims of Hyderabad were real brothers. The  
Muslim Rulers conferred Jagirs,  
 Mansabs, Daishmukhis, Zamindaris on their Hindu subjects, without discrimination. If they had been communally-minded, nothing on earth could have forced them to bestow favours on their Hindu subjects. If they had been communally minded, nothing could have stopped them from setting afoot a powerful proselytisation campaign to swell their numbers. If they had been communally-minded, nothing could have forced them to appoint Hindus as Ministers and Secretaries to Government. The history of the Asaf Jahi rule in

Hyderabad is a clear vindication of the claim of our sovereign that religious toleration and universal peace have been the articles of his predecessors' creed, which he is proud to follow.

There was no Hindu-Muslim problem in Hyderabad till very recently. The little that one hears of now is a recent growth of extraneous origin. The Mulki Movement sounds the clarion call of "Back to the good old days" to all subjects of His Exalted Highness. The call sounds appropriate in many other ways.

It is a blatant fact, and it is idle to shut one's eyes to it, that the Hindu subjects of H. E. H. the Nizam have certain grievances against the Government, some real and some imaginary. It is also a fact, though less known, that the Muslim subjects of H. E. H. are very badly off in many ways. As such there is discontent all over.

The Mulki Movement is the product of this  
Movement product  
of Discontent. discontent and it proposes to  
mobilise the existing discontent  
for constructive and useful purposes. The movement would thrive as long as there is popular discontent in the State and will survive all attempts to crush it. Therefore, shutting up a few active workers is no solution of the problem

at all. In fact it is ridiculous to expect that it will have any but a stimulating effect on the movement.

The movement is out to find a formula that will satisfy the vested interests, the Hindu and Muslim subjects of H. E. H. the Nizam and meet with the gracious approval of our benign Master. The movement has a great mission to perform and it has come to stay.

In conclusion we wish to assure all and sundry that we mean well. We have, as explained in a previous manifesto, certain noble and lofty ideals to achieve, and we hope that nothing will be done or said to deflect us from our right and proper course.

As to those who say that the atmosphere is not ripe yet for any such movement to succeed, our respectful and grim reply is: we cannot wait for the atmosphere to change. We must work to change the atmosphere. Some one must bestir himself, some one must break this suffocating silence? Some one must bell the cat. Some one must risk his career, his future, his pleasures and luxurious pursuits. All honour to him who does it.

Fetish of  
Atmosphere.

If we wait for the atmosphere to change, we will have to wait till Doomsday.  
 Let's be Pioneers. As it is, it is too late. Much irreparable harm has been done to our glorious State through our inertness, and our shameful failure to rally round the Asaf Jahi banner when insidious and subtle attempts were being made to lower its prestige. A healthy vigorous popular movement is long overdue in the State. Let us be the pioneers in this direction. Let us do something to better our position. We cannot wait till we are allowed to strive for our own betterment. That would be asking for the moon, because the strength of the interested parties lies in our weakness, in our inertia, in our ineptitude and in our fears. Something must be done. Let us begin. Nothing matters, so long as we mean well by the Crown and the Country.

LONG LIVE THE NIZAM, THE ROYAL EMBODIMENT  
 OF DECCANI NATIONALISM

## APPENDIX IV.

### **An Appeal to Hyderabad Muslims.**

By "one of them"

Friends !

In the life of every people, a time comes when they have to take stock of themselves, review their past dispassionately and mould their present for a better future. Such a day has come for the Muslims of Hyderabad.

It will hardly need much convincing to bring home to you that we have been living too much in the past and have been drawing too much on our past. We cannot take to ourselves the credit if our past was great and glorious. We are resting as it were, on the laurels of our forefathers, in as much as we have ceased to bother about our future. The glamour of the days gone by has so dazzled our vision as to make us thoroughly blind to the darkness that is ahead. There is no knowing what will happen to us if we travel on without adjusting our outlook to the present. The object of this humble and respectful appeal is to prepare your eyes for the future.

“The old order changeth yielding place to new,  
 And God fulfils himself in many ways,  
 Lest one good custom should corrupt the  
 world.”

Change is the Philosophy of life. Change alone is eternal. Such is the will of God. You and I cannot help it. Nobody can. Like good Muslims, all we have to do is to submit to the Will of God cheerfully and without a word of murmur.

There was a time when we called ourselves the ruling class in Hyderabad. There was substance in that claim. Circumstances, too well known to every student of History, circumstances over which we have no control, have brought about a cataclysmic change, not only in our position but also in the popular outlook on life. If today we continued to style ourselves as the ruling class, it would be merely an empty boast. Even if our Sovereign had really possessed all the powers that sovereignty carries with it, we would be wrong in counting ourselves as members of the ruling class, for the simple reason that a sovereign has no religion, in the sense that we understand that term. His religion, if so it could be called, is the service of his subjects. If, in private life,

the ruler happens to be a Muslim, does it behove such of his subjects as find themselves by the sheer accident of their birth in the Muslim fold, to claim superiority over those who are not Muslims ?

If the claim of Hyderabad Muslims that they are members of the ruling class had any substance behind it, then, there should not have been a single beggar in the Muslim Community in Hyderabad. The fact, however, is that every second beggar you meet in the streets is a Muslim. A majority of those who are convicted in the Criminal Courts, a majority of those against whom decrees are passed by the Civil Courts, a majority of those against whom warrants of attachment are issued, a majority of those who swell the Marwari's Bank account, a majority of those who mortgage their wives' jewellery and ancestral property are members of the so-called ruling class. Can rulers be also beggars, criminals, defaulters, and paupers? How absurd ! This is a theory that is highly derogatory to our ruler. This is a theory that would hurt our ruler's sense of pride.

Let us rid our minds of the idea that we are the members of the ruling class, because we are not. Let us consider ourselves the subjects of our ruler

like members of any other community, equal alike in all respects. If we, the Muslims of Hyderabad, banish the ruling class complex from our mind, half of our troubles would automatically vanish. If, unfortunately, we stick to this obnoxious theory, we would soon find ourselves left badly in the lurch. The Hindus of Hyderabad will, in that case, keep aloof from us because we do not identify ourselves with them, and the Ruler will refuse to countenance our claim saying that he is the Ruler of the whole of Hyderabad and not of Muslim Hyderabad alone. This what the Ruler should say, because such is the case. No ruler would care to lose the allegiance and love of 85 per cent of his subjects, by identifying himself solely with the balance of less than 15 per cent. Those Muslims who expect the Sovereign to commit such a political mistake are not loyal and true to him. The only right and proper course for Hyderabad Muslims is to consider themselves the subjects of Nizam as much as the Hindus are. They should make common cause with their non-muslim brethren, make amends to them for their past injustices, if any, and start with a clean slate as brothers who meet after a long separation and work out their salvation conjointly and in a spirit of devotion to each other.

Whether we like it or not, democracy is knocking at our doors. We might delay its entry, but we cannot keep it out. The more we make it wait, the more ferocious will be its rush. Like good Muslims why should we not prepare ourselves for the inevitable and yield to it gracefully. It is much better for us in the long run, and a much wiser course to adopt. Let us trust our fellow subjects and we shall find them eager to make common cause with us. They will immediately cleanse their hearts of all bitterness, if such there is. But if we consider that we are a class by ourselves now, they will continue to consider us as such when democracy comes and we will find ourselves segregated. Let us beware of that day.

My first appeal to you, therefore, is that we should get rid of the ruling class complex and embrace our Hindu fellow subjects.

And why should'nt we do so? Do not both of us owe allegiance to one and the same master? Have we not a common historical and traditional past? Do we not share common grievances? Are we not face to face with common economic and political problems?

All of us breathe the same air, eat bread from the same soil, drink water from the same

tanks and are subject to the same virulent type of epidemics. What more bonds are needed to tie us closer together ?

Muslims of Hyderabad: Make common cause with your Hindu brethren. You will not only make your own position secure but make the throne of Hyderabad a mightier place for the NIZAMS to sit on. These are no empty words; they bear historical truths.

It might be apprehended that since Muslims form a small percentage of the Hyderabad population, they would be swamped under a democratic form of Government. My reply to that is that the constitution that we are envisaging would be such that it would not admit of rule by communal cliques at all. Communal parties would give place to parties formed on the basis of economic and political programmes. Deccani Nationalism would defeat both Hindu and Muslim communalism.

LONG LIVE THE NIZAM, THE ROYAL EMBODIMENT  
OF DECCANI NATIONALISM !